arXiv:alg-geom/9607002v1 3 Jul 1996

A relative notion of algebraic Lie group and applications to n-stacks

Carlos Simpson
Laboratoire Emile Picard (UMR 5580 CNRS)
Université Paul Sabatier
31062 Toulouse CEDEX, France

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the big etale site of schemes over $k = \mathbf{C}$. If S is a scheme of finite type over k, let $\mathcal{X}/S$ denote the big etale site of schemes over S. The goal of this paper is to introduce a full subcategory of the category of sheaves of groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$, which we will call *the category of presentable group sheaves* (§2), with the following properties.

1. The category of presentable group sheaves contains those group sheaves which are representable by group schemes of finite type over S (Corollary 2.6).
2. The category of presentable group sheaves is closed under kernel, quotient (by a normal subgroup sheaf which is presentable), and extension (Theorem 1.13).
3. If $S' \to S$ is a morphism then pullback takes presentable group sheaves on S to presentable group sheaves on S' (Lemma 3.2).
4. If $S' \to S$ is a finite morphism then direct image takes presentable group sheaves on S' to presentable group sheaves on S (Lemma 3.3).
5. If $S = Spec(k)$ then presentable group sheaves are just group schemes of finite type over $Spec(k)$ (Theorem 6.4). In particular if $\mathcal{G}$ is a presentable group sheaf over any S then the pullback to each point $Spec(k) \to S$ is an algebraic group.
6. There is a notion of connectedness extending the usual notion over $Spec(k)$ and compatible with quotients, extensions, pullbacks and finite direct images; and a presentable group sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ has a largest connected presentable subsheaf $\mathcal{G}^0 \subset \mathcal{G}$ which we call the *connected component* (Theorem 7.2).
7. A presentable group sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ has a Lie algebra object $Lie(\mathcal{G})$ (Theorem 9.1) which is a vector sheaf with bracket operation (see below for a discussion of the notion of vector sheaf—in the case $S = Spec(k)$ it is the same thing as a finite dimensional k-vector space).
8. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected presentable group sheaf then $\mathcal{G}/Z(\mathcal{G})$ is determined up to isomorphism by the Lie algebra sheaf $Lie(\mathcal{G})$ (where $Z(\mathcal{G})$ denotes the center of $\mathcal{G}$). This is Theorem 9.6 below.

We envision the category of presentable group sheaves as a generalisation relative to an arbitrary base scheme S, of the category of algebraic Lie groups over $Spec(\mathbf{C})$.

We mention here a few questions related to the analogy with classical algebraic groups. Property 8 poses an obvious existence problem: given a Lie algebra object in the category of vector sheaves, does it come from a presentable group sheaf with vector sheaf center? I don't know the answer to this question. We do know, however, that $Aut(L)$ is a presentable group sheaf (Lemma 9.2). Another question is the existence of a "universal covering", i.e. a morphism $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \to \mathcal{G}$ surjective with finite kernel such that for any other such morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ there is a factorization $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \to \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$. There are obvious questions about the generalisation of the theory of representations to the case of presentable group sheaves. The first among these is whether there always exists a faithful representation into $Aut(V)$ for V a vector sheaf. I suspect that the answer is no, but don't have a counterexample. For connected group sheaves this problem concerns only the center, because we always have the adjoint representation of $\mathcal{G}$ on $Lie(\mathcal{G})$. Beyond the question of the description of the representations, there is also the question of whether a suitable tannakian theory exists, namely given a group $\mathcal{G} \subset Aut(V)$, is $\mathcal{G}$ defined as the stabilizer of some $\mathcal{G}$-invariant sub-vector-sheaf U in a tensor power of V?

The motivation for introducing presentable group sheaves comes from the theory of homotopy types over $Spec(\mathbf{C})$, or what Grothendieck called "schematization of homotopy types" in [Gr2]. We will discuss the application to this theory at the end of the paper—note also that it is explained in essentially the same way in [Si] where some applications to nonabelian de Rham cohomology are also announced. Briefly, the considerations are as follows. A homotopy type over $\mathcal{X}$ (which we call an "n-stack") is a presheaf of topological spaces on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying a homotopic descent condition ("fibrant" in the terminology of Jardine [Ja], cf [Si]). This condition is the generalisation of the descent condition that goes into the definition of 1-stack. An n-stack or fibrant presheaf T has homotopy sheaves as follows. First, $\pi_0(T)$ is a sheaf of sets on $\mathcal{X}$. Then for $i \geq 1$ if $S \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in T(S)$, $\pi_i(T|_{\mathcal{X}/S}, t)$ is a sheaf of groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$ (abelian if $i \geq 2$). In the fibrant presheaf point of view, these homotopy sheaves are the sheafifications of the presheaves which one defines in the obvious way. These things satisfy the same sorts of properties as in the homotopy theory of spaces. In particular there are notions of homotopy fiber products and (as special cases) homotopy fibers and loop or path spaces. The homotopy groups of the homotopy fiber of a morphism fit into the usual long exact sequence (and there is a similar exact sequence for homotopy fiber products in general). There are also notions of morphism spaces $Hom(T, T')$ which are spaces or n-groupoids (depending on the point of view) and internal morphism objects $\underline{Hom}(T, T')$ which are n-stacks whose global sections are the morphism spaces.

The main particularity of this situation is that $\pi_0(T)$ can be nontrivial and not just the union a set of points. Because of this, one must consider basepoints not only in $T(Spec(k))$ but in $T(S)$ for any scheme S (say, of finite type) in order to get the full picture of T. One is thus lead to consider sheaves of groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$.

We would like to define a restricted class of n-stacks or fibrant presheaves of spaces which we will call *presentable*. We would like this category to be closed under homotopy fiber products and also under the truncation (or coskeleton) operations of eliminating the homotopy groups above a certain level. From these requirements it follows that the condition for inclusion in the class of presentable presheaves of spaces should be expressed solely in terms of the homotopy group sheaves. From the exact sequences for homotopy fibers or more generally fiber products, one can see that the category of group sheaves allowable as homotopy group sheaves of presentable spaces must be closed under kernel, cokernel and extension. We would like our allowable group sheaves to be the algebraic Lie groups when the base space is $Spec(k)$, and of course for doing anything useful we need notions of connectedness and an infinitesimal (Lie algebra) picture. These are the reasons which lead us to look for a notion of sheaf of groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$ with the properties listed above.

I should add a note of caution about the terminology, for we propose the terminology *presentable group sheaf* and also *presentable n-stack*. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a sheaf of sets on $\mathcal{X}/S$ (i.e. a 0-stack) which happens to have a group structure, then the condition that $\mathcal{G}$ be presentable as a 0-stack is *not* the same as the condition that $\mathcal{G}$ be a presentable group sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$. The right way to think of a sheaf of groups is as corresponding to a 1-stack which we can denote $K(\mathcal{G}, 1)$ or $B\mathcal{G}$ (with a morphism to S). From this point of view the terminologies are compatible: $\mathcal{G}$ is a presentable group sheaf over S if and only if $K(\mathcal{G}, 1)$ is a presentable 1-stack.

Let's look more carefully at the reasoning that leads to our definition of presentable n-stack. What are we going to do with a presentable n-stack T? If W is (the n-truncation of) a finite CW complex considered as a constant n-stack on $\mathcal{X}$ then we can look at the n-stack $Hom(W, T)$. This is the *nonabelian cohomology of W with coefficients in T*. If $T = K(\mathcal{O}, n)$ is the Eilenberg-MacLane presheaf with homotopy group sheaf equal to the structure sheaf of rings $\mathcal{O}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ in degree n, then $\pi_0 Hom(W, T)$ is just the cohomology $H^n(W, \mathbf{C})$—or rather the sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ represented by this vector

space. Similarly, if G is a group scheme over $\mathbf{C}$ then for $T = K(G,1) = BG$ we get that $Hom(W,G)$ is the moduli stack for flat principal G-bundles or equivalently representations $\pi_1(W) \to G$. We hope to obtain an appropriate mixture of these cases by considering a more general class of n-stacks T. In particular we would like to have a *Kunneth formula* for two CW complexes V and W,

$$\underline{Hom}(U, \underline{Hom}(V,T)) = \underline{Hom}(U \times V, T).$$

One can imagine for example the problem of trying to compute the moduli stack of flat principal G-bundles on $U \times V$ in terms of a Kunneth formula as above. One is forced to consider the cohomology of U with coefficients in the moduli stack $T' = \underline{Hom}(V, BG)$, and this stack is not necessarily connected ($\pi_0(T')$ is roughly speaking the moduli space of principal G-bundles).

The Kunneth formula is not an end in itself, as it is rare for a space to decompose into a product. It points the way to a "Leray-Serre theory" which could be more generally useful. If $W \to U$ is a morphism we would be led to consider a relative morphism stack $T' = \underline{Hom}(W/U, T) \to U$ and then try to take the n-stack of sections $U \to T'$, a sort of *nonabelian cohomology with twisted coefficients*. I haven't fully thought about this yet (and in particular not about the de Rham theory—see below—which seems to be significantly more complicated than that which is needed in the constant coefficient case, for example to make sense of the Kunneth formula).

The motivation for all of this is to be able to do geometric versions of the nonabelian cohomology in the case where W is, say, a smooth projective variety. It is announced with some sketches of proofs in [Si], how to get a de Rham version of the morphism space $\underline{Hom}(W_{DR}, T)$ when T is a presentable n-stack. We want of course to have the (analytic) isomorphism between de Rham and Betti cohomology. Needless to say, this will not work for an arbitrary n-stack T on X (for example if one takes $T = W$ to a constant stack associated to a CW complex which is an algebraic variety then there will probably be nothing in $Hom(W_{DR}, W)$ corresponding to the identity in $Hom(W,W)$). We need to impose conditions on T which guarantee that it is reasonably close to the examples $K(\mathcal{O}, n)$ or $K(G,1)$ given above (in these cases, the de Rham-Betti isomorphism works as is already well known).

As a first approach, the condition we want seems to be that the homotopy group sheaves should be representable by group schemes over the base S. In the case where T is the moduli stack of flat principal G-bundles on a space V, encountered above when looking at the Kunneth formula, the π_1 sheaves are indeed representable (the moduli stack is an algebraic stack). Unfortunately the condition of being representable is not stable under cokernels, but as explained above this is important if we want our notion of good n-stack to be stable under homotopy fiber products.

Before going directly to the conclusion that we need a category stable under kernels, cokernels and extensions, we can analyze a bit more precisely just what is needed. Notice first of all that the algebraic de Rham theory is not going to work well in the case of higher cohomology with coefficients in the multiplicative group scheme, i.e. when $T = K(\mathbf{G}_m, n)$ for $n \geq 2$. I won't go into the explanation of that here! Thus, at least for the algebraic de Rham theory we would like to have an appropriate notion of unipotent abelian group sheaf. Not yet having come up with a reasonable general theory of this, we can replace this notion by the (possibly more restrictive) notion of *vector sheaf*.

The notion of vector sheaf is explained in §4 below. The reader may actually wish to start by reading this section, since the theory of vector sheaves is in some sense a paradigm, applicable only for abelian group sheaves, of what we are trying to do in general. The notion of vector sheaf was introduced by A. Hirschowitz [Hi] who called it "U-coherent sheaf". He defined the category of U-coherent sheaves as the smallest abelian category of sheaves of abelian groups containing the coherent sheaves (note that the category of coherent sheaves is not abelian on the big etale site or any big site). We take a more constructive approach, defining the notion of vector sheaf in terms of presentations,

although in the end the two notions are equivalent. The notion of vector sheaf doesn't work too nicely in characteristic $p > 0$, basically because the Frobenius automorphism of the sheaf $\mathcal{O}$ is not linear, so the linear structure is no longer encoded in the sheaf structure. As we try in the beginning of the paper to put off the hypothesis of characteristic zero as long as possible, and as the notion of vector sheaf comes into the analysis at a later stage (the infinitesima study related to properties 7 and 8 listed above), I have decided not to put the section on vector sheaves at the beginning. Still, it is essentially self-contained for the reader who wishes to start there.

In considering the algebraic de Rham theory we will only be looking at n-stacks T with $\pi_i(T,t)$ a vector sheaf on S for $t \in T(S)$ and $i \geq 2$. What does this mean for our restriction on $\pi_1(T,t)$? Going back to the question of stability under fiber products, we see from looking at the long exact homotopy sheaf sequence that the minimum that is absolutely necessary is that our class of group sheaves G be stable under central extension by a vector sheaf. On the other hand it also must be stable under taking kernels.

One could thus hope to make good on a *minimalist approach* saying that we should look at the category of group sheaves generated by representable group sheaves (affine, say—this again would be needed to make the de Rham theory work), under the operations of kernel and central extension by a vector sheaf. A vector sheaf always has a presentation as the cokernel of a morphism of *vector schemes*, i.e. representable vector-space objects over the base S (these are sometimes called *linear spaces* in the complex analytic category [Gra] [Fis] [A-M]). The most natural approach then is to say, suppose a group sheaf G has a presentation as the cokernel of a morphism $F_2 \to F_1$ of representable group sheaves, and suppose E is a central extension of G by a vector sheaf U which is itself the cokernel of a morphism $V_2 \to V_1$ of vector schemes. Then try to combine these into a presentation of E with, for example, a surjection $V_1 \times F_1 \to E$. The problem (which I was not able to solve although I don't claim that it is impossible) is then to lift the multiplication of E to an associative multiplication on $V_1 \times F_1$.

As I didn't see how to do this, a slightly more general approach was needed, wherein we consider groups which have presentations by objects where the multiplication lifts but not necessarily to a multiplication satisfying the associativity property. This is the reasoning that leads to the definition of *S-vertical morphism:* a morphism where one can lift things such as multiplications in a nice way cf §2. We finally come to the definition of *presentable group sheaf* as a group sheaf G which admits a vertical surjection $X \to G$ from a scheme of finite type over S, and such that there is a vertical surjection $R \to X \times_G X$ again from a scheme of finite type over S.

One could, on the other hand, take a *maximalist approach* and try to include anything that seems vaguely algebraic. This would mean, for example, looking at sheaves G such that there are surjections (in the etale sense, although not necessarily etale morphisms) $X \to G$ and $R \to X \times_G X$ with X and R schemes of finite type over the base S. We call this condition P2. This might also work (in fact it might even be the case that a P2 group sheaf is automatically presentable). However, I was not able to obtain a reasonable infinitesimal analysis which could lead, for example, to the notion of connected component—though again, I don't claim that this could never work.

In a similar vein, one might point out that there is a fairly limited range of situations in which we use the lifting properties going into the definition of verticality. I have chosen to state the condition of verticality in what seems to be the most natural setting, but this leads to requiring that many more lifting properties be satisfied than what we actually use. One could rewrite the definition of verticality to include only those lifting properties that we use afterward. It might be interesting to see if this change makes any difference in which group sheaves are allowed as presentable.

All in all, the definitions we give here of presentable group sheaf and of presentable n-stack are

first attempts at giving useful and reasonable notions, but is is quite possible that they would need to be altered in the future in view of applications.

A word about the characteristic of the ground field (or base scheme). While our aim is to work over a field of characteristic zero, there are certain parts of our discussion valid over any base scheme, namely those concerning the abstract method for defining conditions of presentability. When it comes down to finding conditions which result in a nice theory (and in particular which result in a theory having the required local structure) we must restrict ourselves to characteristic zero. It is possible that a variant could work nicely in positive characteristic, so we will present the first part of the argument concerning the definition of presentability (which is valid over any base scheme), in full generality (§1) before specifying in characteristic zero which morphisms we want to use in the presentations (§2). Actually the definition given in §2 works in any characteristic but we can only prove anything about local properties in characteristic zero (§§4-9), so it is probably the "right" definition only in characteristic zero. With an appropriate different definition of verticality (certainly incorporating divided powers) what we do in these later sections might be made to work in any characteristic.

Notations

We fix a noetherian ground ring k, for sections 1-3. From section 4 on, we assume that k is an uncountable field of characteristic zero, and we may when necessary assume that the ground field is $k = \mathbf{C}$.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the site of noetherian schemes over k with the etale topology (this is known as the "big etale site").

If $S \in \mathcal{X}$ then we denote by $\mathcal{X}/S$ the site of schemes over S (again with the etale topology).

A *sheaf* on $\mathcal{X}$ means (unless otherwise specified) a sheaf of sets. For a sheaf of groups, we sometimes use the terminology *group sheaf*.

We will confuse notations between an object of $\mathcal{X}$ and the sheaf it represents.

Denote by $*$ the sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ with values equal to the one-point set; it is represented by $Spec(k)$ (and we can interchange these notations at will).

If S is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ (most often represented by an object) then we have the site $\mathcal{X}/S$ of objects of $\mathcal{X}$ together with morphisms to S. There is an equivalence between the notions of sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ and sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ with morphism to S. Since we will sometimes need to distinguish these, we introduce the following notations.

If $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ then its *restriction up* to $\mathcal{X}/S$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}/S}$, with the formula

$$\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}/S}(Y \to S) = \mathcal{F}(Y).$$

If $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ then we denote by $Res_{S/*}\mathcal{F}$ the corresponding sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ together with its morphism

$$Res_{S/*}\mathcal{F} \to S.$$

It is defined by the statement that $Res_{S/*}\mathcal{F}(Y)$ is equal to the set of pairs (a, f) where $a : Y \to S$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}(Y \xrightarrow{a} S)$. We call this the *restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ from S down to $*$*.

More generally if $S' \to S$ is a morphism and if $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S'$ then we obtain a sheaf $Res_{S'/S}\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}/S$ called the *restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ from S' down to S*.

The operations of restriction up and restriction down are not inverses: we have the formula, for a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}/S$,

$$Res_{S'/S}(\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}/S'}) = \mathcal{F} \times_S S'.$$

On the other hand, suppose $p : \mathcal{F} \to S'$ is a morphism of sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S$. Then we denote by $\mathcal{F}/S'$ the corresponding sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S'$ (the data of the morphism is implicit in the notation). It is defined by the statement that $\mathcal{F}/S'(Y \to S')$ is equal to the set of $u \in \mathcal{F}(Y \to S)$ such that $p(u) \in S'(Y \to S)$ is equal to the given morphism $Y \to S'$. For another point of view note that there is a tautological section of $(S'/S)|_{\mathcal{X}/S'}$, and $\mathcal{F}/S'$ is the preimage of this section in $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{X}/S'}$.

As a special case we get that if $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}/*$ with a morphism $\mathcal{F} \to S$ then we obtain a sheaf $\mathcal{F}/S$ on $\mathcal{X}/S$.

The operations

$$(\mathcal{F} \to S') \mapsto \mathcal{F}/S'$$

from sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S$ with morphisms to S' to sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S'$, and

$$\mathcal{F}' \mapsto (Res_{S'/S}\mathcal{F}' \to S'$$

from sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S'$ to sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S$ with morphisms to S', are inverses. For this reason it is often tempting to ignore the strict notational convention and simply use the same notations for the two objects. This is not too dangerous except in the last section of the paper where we will try to be careful.

If a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is representable by an object $F \in \mathcal{X}$ and if $F \to S$ is a morphism then $\mathcal{F}/S$ is representable by the same object F together with its morphism, considered as an object of $\mathcal{X}/S$. For this reason we will sometimes drop the notation $\mathcal{F}/S$ and just denote this as $\mathcal{F}$ when there is no risk of confusion (and in fact the attentive reader will notice that even in the definition two paragraphs ago we have written S' when we should have written S'/S in the first sentence...but the second version would have been impossible because not yet defined...!)

Finally there is another natural operation: suppose $\pi : S' \to S$ is a morphism and $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S'$. Its *direct image* is the sheaf $\pi_*(\mathcal{F})$ defined by the statement that

$$\pi_*(\mathcal{F})(Y \to S) := \mathcal{F}(Y \times_S S' \to S').$$

This is *not* the same thing as the restriction down from S' to S. Think of the case where S is one point and S' is a collection of several points. The value of $Res_{S'/S}(\mathcal{F})$ at S is the *union* of the values of $\mathcal{F}$ over the points in S' whereas the value of $\pi_*(\mathcal{F})$ at S is the *product* of the values of $\mathcal{F}$ at the points in S'.

1. Presentability conditions for sheaves

We will define several conditions, numbered $P1$, $P2$, $P4(\mathcal{M})$, $P5(\mathcal{M})$ (whereas two other conditions $P3$ and $P3\frac{1}{2}$ will be defined later, in §2). The last two depend on a choice of a class $\mathcal{M}$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{X}$ subject to certain properties set out below. In the upcoming section we then specify which class $\mathcal{M}$ we are interested in (at least in characteristic zero), the class of *vertical morphisms*. Since the preliminary results depend only on the formal properties of $\mathcal{M}$ we thought it might be useful to state them in general rather than just for the class of vertical morphisms, this is why we have the seeming complication of introducing $\mathcal{M}$ into the notations for our properties.

We also introduce *boundedness conditions* denoted $B1$ and $B2$. These conditions sum up what is necessary in order to be able to apply Artin approximation.

Fix a base scheme $S \in \mathcal{X}$. In what follows, we work in the category of sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S$. Thus a sheaf is supposed to be on $\mathcal{X}/S$ unless otherwise specified.

P1. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *P1* if there is a surjective morphism of sheaves $X \to \mathcal{F}$ where X is represented by a scheme of finite type over S. We may assume that X is affine.
P2. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *P2* if there are surjective morphisms of sheaves $X \to \mathcal{F}$ and $Y \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ where X and Y are represented by schemes of finite type over S. We may assume that X and Y are affine.

Lemma 1.1 *If G is a sheaf of groups which is P1, and G acts on a sheaf F which is P2, then the quotient sheaf F/G is again P2.*

Proof: Choose surjections $\varphi : X \to F$ and $(p_1, p_2) : Y \to X \times_F X$. The action is a map $G \times F \to F$, and we can choose a surjection $(q_1, q_2) : W \to G \times X$ (with W an affine scheme, by condition P1 for G), such that the action lifts to a map $m : W \to X$. There is obviously a surjection $X \to F/G$. We have a map

$$W \times_X Y \to X \times X$$

(where the maps used in the fiber product are $m : W \to X$ and $p_1 : Y \to X$), defined by

$$(w, y) \mapsto (q_2(w), p_2(y)).$$

This map surjects onto the fiber product $X \times_{F/G} X$. It clearly maps into this fiber product. The map is surjective because if $(x, x') \in X \times X$ with $g\varphi(x) = \varphi(x')$ then for a point w of W lying above (g, x) we have $\varphi(m(w)) = g\varphi(x) = \varphi(x')$; in particular there is a point y of Y with $p_1(y) = m(w)$ and $p_2(y) = x'$, so the point (w, y) maps to (x, x'). Our surjection

$$W \times_X Y \to X \times_{F/G} X$$

now shows that F/G is P2. □

Remark: These conditions are independent of base scheme S for finite-type morphisms. More precisely if $S' \to S$ is a morphism of finite type and if $\mathcal{F}'$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S'$ then denoting by $\mathcal{F} = Res_{S'/S}\mathcal{F}'$ its restriction down to S we have that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P1$ (resp. $P2$) if and only if $\mathcal{F}'$ is $P1$ (resp. $P2$).

Boundedness conditions

We consider the following boundedness conditions for a sheaves on $\mathcal{X}$. These two conditions are designed to contain exactly the information needed to apply the Artin approximation theorem [Ar].
B1. We say that a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ is *B1* if, for any k-algebra B, we have that

$$\lim_{\rightarrow} \mathcal{F}(Spec(B')) \to \mathcal{F}(Spec(B))$$

is an isomorphism, where the limit is taken over the subalgebras $B' \subset B$ which are of finite type over k. This is equivalent to the local finite type condition of Artin [Ar].
B2. We say that a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ is *B2* if, for any complete local ring A, we have that the morphism

$$\mathcal{F}(Spec(A)) \to \lim_{\leftarrow} \mathcal{F}(Spec(A/\mathbf{m}^i)$$

is an isomorphism.

The **Artin approximation theorem** ([Ar]) can now be stated as follows.

Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf of sets which is B1 and B2. If $S = Spec(A)$ is an affine scheme with point $P \in S$ corresponding to a maximal ideal $\mathbf{m} \subset A$ then for any

$$\eta \in \lim_{\leftarrow} \mathcal{F}(Spec(A/\mathbf{m}^i))$$

and for $i_0 \geq 0$ there exists an etale neighborhood $P \in S' \to S$ and an element $\eta' \in \mathcal{F}(S')$ agreeing with η over $Spec(A/\mathbf{m}^{i_0})$.

Lemma 1.2 *1. If $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are B1 (resp. B2) and f, g are two morphisms from $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{G}$ then the equalizer is again B1 (resp. B2).*
2. Suppose $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a surjective morphism of sheaves. If $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{F}$ are B1 then $\mathcal{G}$ is B1.

Proof: Fix $S = Spec(A)$ and $\{B_i\}$ our directed system of A-algebras. Let $B = \lim_{\rightarrow} B_i$. Suppose $\eta \in \mathcal{G}(B)$. There is a natural morphism

$$\lim_{\rightarrow} \mathcal{G}(B_i) \to \mathcal{G}(B).$$

First we prove injectivity. Suppose $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{G}(B_i)$ map to the same element of $\mathcal{G}(B)$. We may choose an etale surjection of finite type $Spec(B_i') \to Spec(B_i)$ such that the restrictions φ' and ψ' lift to elements $u, v \in \mathcal{F}(B_i)$. Their images in $\mathcal{F}(B')$ give a point $(u, v)_{B'}$ in $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{F}(B')$ (here $B' := B \otimes_{B_i} B_i'$). By the condition B1 for the fiber product, there is a $j \geq i$ such that this point comes from a point $\eta \in \mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{F}(B_j')$. On the other hand, note that the product $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$ is B1. The image of η in $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}(B')$ is the same as that of (u, v); and by the B1 condition for the product, there is $k \geq j$ such that the image of η in $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}(B_k')$ is equal to the image of (u, v). In particular, $(u|_{Spec(B_k')}, v|_{Spec(B_k')})$ lies in the fiber product $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{F}(B_k')$. In other words, u and v have the same images in $\mathcal{G}(B_k')$. These images are the restrictions of the original φ, ψ. Since $Spec(B_k') \to Spec(B_k)$ is an etale surjection, the images of φ and ψ in $\mathcal{G}(B_k)$ are the same. This proves the injectivity.

Now we prove surjectivity. Then there exists an etale surjection of finite type

$$Spec(B') \to Spec(B)$$

such that $\eta|_{Spec(B')}$ comes from an element $\rho \in \mathcal{F}(B')$. The functor "etale surjections of finite type" is itself B1, so there is an etale $Spec(B_i') \to Spec(B_i)$ inducing B'. Then $B' = \lim_{\rightarrow} B_j'$ where $B_j' = B_j \otimes_{B_i} B_i'$ for $j \geq i$. By the property B1 for $\mathcal{F}$ there is some j such that ρ comes from $\rho_j \in \mathcal{F}(B_j')$. We obtain an element $\eta_j' \in \mathcal{G}(B_j')$ mapping to $\eta' := \eta|_{Spec(B')}$. The two pullbacks of η' to $Spec(B' \otimes_B B')$ are equal. Note that

$$B' \otimes_B B' = \lim_{\rightarrow} B_k' \otimes_{B_k} B_k',$$

so by the above injectivity, there is some k such that the two pullbacks of $\eta_j|_{Spec(B_k')}$ to $Spec(B_k' \otimes_{B_k} B_k')$ are equal. Now the sheaf condition for $\mathcal{G}$ means that $\eta_j|_{Spec(B_k')}$ descends to an element $\eta_k \in \mathcal{G}(B_k)$. The restriction of η_k to B' is equal to the restriction of η, so the sheaf condition for $\mathcal{G}$ implies that the restriction of η_k to $Spec(B)$ is η. □

Remark: The direct product of a finite number of B1 (resp. B2) sheaves is again B1 (resp. B2) so part 1 of the lemma implies that the properties B1 and B2 are maintained under fiber products.

Theorem 1.3 *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf which is P2. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is B1. If the ground field is uncountable, then $\mathcal{F}$ is B2.*

Proof: The condition B1 follows from the previous lemma. Indeed, let $X \to \mathcal{F}$ and $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ be the morphisms given by the property P2, with X and R of finite type (in particular, B1). Note that $R \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X} R = R \times_{X \times X} R$ is a scheme of finite type, so the lemma implies that $X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ is B1; another application of the lemma then shows that $\mathcal{F}$ is B1.

For B2, let $S = Spec(A)$ with A a complete local ring, and let $S_n := Spec(A/\mathbf{m}^{n+1})$. Let $X \to \mathcal{F}$ and $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ be the morphisms given by the property P2, with X and R of finite type over S. Schemes of finite type are B2. We show surjectivity of the map

$$\mathcal{F}(S) \to \lim_{\leftarrow} \mathcal{F}(S_n).$$

Suppose (φ_n) is a compatible system of elements of $\mathcal{F}(S_n)$. Let

$$E_n := \{x_n \in X(S_n) : \quad x_n \mapsto \varphi_n\}.$$

Note that E_n is a nonempty closed subset of the scheme $X(S_n)$ (that is, the scheme whose $Spec(k)$-valued points are $X(S_n)$). Let

$$E'_n := \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathrm{im}(E_m \to E_n);$$

this is an intersection of a decreasing family of nonempty constructible subsets of E_n. Since k is uncountable, this intersection is nonempty. Indeed, the closures of the images form a decreasing family of closed sets, which stabilizes by the noetherian property of E_n; then within this closed subset, the dense constructible subsets contain open sets which are complements of proper closed subsets. The union of countably many proper closed subsets is a proper subset, so the intersection of the open complements is nonempty. (Note however that E'_n is not necessarily constructible).

The morphism $E'_{n+1} \to E'_n$ is surjective. To see this, suppose $u \in E'_n$. We can consider the subsets

$$D_m := \{v \in E_m, \ \ v \mapsto u\}.$$

These are closed subsets of E_m, nonempty by the condition $u \in E'_n$. Let $D'_{n+1} = \bigcap_{m \geq n+1} \mathrm{im}(D_m \to D_{n+1})$. By the same proof as above, D'_{n+1} is nonempty. But it is contained in E'_{n+1} and maps to $u \in E'_n$.

The surjectivity of the maps implies that the inverse limit $\lim_{\leftarrow} E'_n$ is nonempty. It is a subset of $\lim_{\leftarrow} X(S_n) = X(S)$, consisting of elements mapping to (φ_n) in $\lim_{\leftarrow} \mathcal{F}(S_n)$. (In fact, this subset is equal to the inverse image of (φ_n).) We obtain an element of $X(S)$, hence an element of $\mathcal{F}(S)$, mapping to (φ_n). This proves surjectivity. Note that this part of the proof only used property P1 for $\mathcal{F}$.

We now prove injectivity. Note that $X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ is P1, so by the proof above, we obtain surjectivity of the morphism

$$X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X(S) \to \lim_{\leftarrow} X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X(S_n).$$

Suppose two elements $u, v \in G(S)$ go to the same element of $G(S_n)$ for all n (we write this $u_n = v_n$). We can lift them to elements $x, y \in X(S)$, and we obtain a compatible sequence of elements $(x_n, y_n) \in X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X(S_n)$. By the surjectivity of the above morphism, there is an element $(x', y') \in X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X(S)$ with $x'_n = x_n$ and $y'_n = y_n$. The images u' and v' of x' and y' in $\mathcal{F}(S)$ are equal. By the B2 property for X, this implies that $x' = x$ and $y' = y$, which shows that $u = v$. □

We have the following Krull-type property.

Lemma 1.4 *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf which is B1 and B2. Then for any scheme S of finite type the natural morphism is an injection*

$$\mathcal{F}(S) \hookrightarrow \prod_{\text{Art. } S' \to S} \mathcal{F}(S')$$

where the product is taken over $S' \to S$ which are artinian and of finite type.

Proof: Suppose $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ agree over all artinian subschemes. Let $\mathcal{G} = S \times_{\mathcal{F}} S$ be the fiber product where f and f' provide the two morphisms from S to $\mathcal{F}$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is B1 and B2 (by the remark following Lemma 1.2). But $\mathcal{G}$ has a (unique) section over any artinian $S' \to S$ and applying B2, B1 and Artin approximation we obtain sections of $\mathcal{G}$ over an etale covering of S. □

Choice of a class of morphisms $\mathcal{M}$

Fix a base scheme $S \in \mathcal{X}$. We assume fixed for the rest of this section a subset $\mathcal{M} \subset Mor(\mathcal{X}/S)$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{X}/S$, containing the identities and closed under composition (i.e. $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of morphism of a subcategory of $\mathcal{X}/S$) subject to the following axioms:
M1 If a and b are composable morphisms such that a and ba are in $\mathcal{M}$, and a is surjective, then b is in $\mathcal{M}$.
M2 Compatibility with base change: if $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-morphism and $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G}$ any morphism, then $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-morphism; and conversely if $a : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism such that $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y \to Y$ is in $\mathcal{M}$ for every S-scheme and morphism $Y \to \mathcal{G}$, then a is in $\mathcal{M}$.
M3 Etale morphisms between schemes are in $\mathcal{M}$.

Remark: It follows from these axioms that the direct product of morphisms in $\mathcal{M}$ is again a morphism in $\mathcal{M}$.

In the next section we will specify a certain such subcategory $\mathcal{M}$, the class of *vertical morphisms*, and show that it satisfies these axioms. But there may be other interesting examples of such a class of morphisms $\mathcal{M}$ to which the following definitions and lemmas could be applied.

We can now extend our list of presentability properties which refer to the class $\mathcal{M}$. We use the notation $\mathcal{M}$-morphism for morphism lying in $\mathcal{M}$. The gap in the numbering is to leave a place for the property $P3$ later. This property (which is absolute rather than relative to a base scheme S) will come up only at the end of the paper, but it turns out to be more logical to number it in between $P2$ and $P4$ (this is the numbering used in [Si]).
P4($\mathcal{M}$) We say that a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ if there exist surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphisms

$$X \to \mathcal{F}$$

and

$$R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$$

with X and R represented by affine schemes of finite type over S.
P5($\mathcal{M}$) We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P5(\mathcal{M})$ if it is $P5(\mathcal{M})$ and if, in addition, the structural morphism $\mathcal{F} \to S$ is in $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 1.5 *If $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are $P4(\mathcal{M})$ (resp. $P5(\mathcal{M})$) then so is $\mathcal{F} \times_S \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof: The presentation is just the product of the presentations for $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. □

Lemma 1.6 *If $f, g : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ are two morphisms, and if $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are $P4(\mathcal{M})$, then the equalizer $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof: Let $X \to \mathcal{H}$, $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{H}} X$, $Z \to \mathcal{G}$ and $T \to Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z$ be $\mathcal{M}$-morphisms with X, R, Z and T schemes of finite type over S. Assume that we have liftings $f', g' : Z \to X$ of f and g. Set

$$W := Z \times_{X \times_S X} R.$$

It is a scheme of finite type over S. Note that the composed map $Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{F} \to Z \to X \times_S X$ factors through $X \times_{\mathcal{H}} X$, and we have

$$W = (Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{F}) \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{H}} X} R.$$

From this and property $M2$, it is clear that the morphism $W \to \mathcal{F}$ is surjective and in $\mathcal{M}$. Now set

$$V := (W \times_S W) \times_{Z \times_S Z} T.$$

Again, this is of finite type over S. We have

$$W \times_{\mathcal{F}} W = W \times_{\mathcal{G}} W = (W \times_S W) \times_{Z \times_S Z} (Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z).$$

Therefore

$$V = (W \times_{\mathcal{F}} W) \times_{Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z} T.$$

From this and property $M2$ it is clear that the morphism $V \to W \times_{\mathcal{F}} W$ is surjective and in $\mathcal{M}$. We obtain the property $P4(\mathcal{M})$ for $\mathcal{F}$. □

Corollary 1.7 *If $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ are two morphisms between $P4(\mathcal{M})$ sheaves, then the fiber product $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{G}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof: The fiber product is the equalizer of the two morphisms $\mathcal{F} \times_S \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$. □

Lemma 1.8 *Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is a group sheaf which is $P5(\mathcal{M})$. If $\mathcal{H}$ acts freely on a sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ with quotient $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$, then the morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F}$ is in $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof: Make a base change by a scheme $Y \to \mathcal{F}$. Let $\mathcal{G}'' := \mathcal{G} \times_{\mathcal{F}} Y$. Then $\mathcal{H}$ acts freely on $\mathcal{G}''$ with quotient Y. Since the morphism $\mathcal{G}'' \to Y$ is surjective in the etale topology, we may find an etale morphism (of finite type and surjective) $Y' \to Y$ such that the base change $\mathcal{G}^3$ of $\mathcal{G}''$ to Y' admits a section. Then $\mathcal{G}^3 = Y' \times_S \mathcal{H}$. In particular, the morphism $\mathcal{G}^3 \to Y'$ is in $\mathcal{M}$, hence also the morphism $\mathcal{G}^3 \to Y$. Finally, the morphism $\mathcal{G}^3 \to \mathcal{G}''$ is surjective, since $Y' \to Y$ is surjective, and is an $\mathcal{M}$-morphism because it becomes an etale morphism after base change to any scheme. By property $M1$, the morphism $\mathcal{G}'' \to Y$ is in $\mathcal{M}$; then by $M2$ the morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F}$ is in $\mathcal{M}$. □

Lemma 1.9 *Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a $P4(\mathcal{M})$ sheaf, and suppose $X \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism with X a scheme of finite type over S. Then there exists a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ with R a scheme of finite type over S.*

Proof: Let $Y \to \mathcal{G}$ and $Q \to Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y$ be the surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphisms. There is an etale surjection $X' \to X$ such that the lifting $X' \to Y$ exists. Note that

$$X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X' = (X' \times_S X') \times_{Y \times_S Y} (Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y).$$

We get that

$$R := (X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X') \times_{Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y} Q = (X' \times_S X') \times_{Y \times_S Y} Q$$

is a scheme of finite type. But also the morphism

$$R = (X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X') \times_{Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y} Q \to X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X'$$

is in $\mathcal{M}$, by property $M2$. Finally,

$$X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X' = (X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X) \times_{X \times_S X} X' \times_S X'$$

and $X' \times_S X' \to X \times_S X$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-morphism by $M3$ and the remark following the properties M. Thus $X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X' \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ is in $\mathcal{M}$ (it is also surjective), so the surjection $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ is in $\mathcal{M}$. □

Theorem 1.10 *Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is a group sheaf which is $P5(\mathcal{M})$, and suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ acts freely on a sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ with quotient $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ (resp. $P5(\mathcal{M})$) if and only if $\mathcal{G}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ (resp. $P5(\mathcal{M})$).*

Proof: By the lemma, the morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F}$ is in $\mathcal{M}$. If $\mathcal{G}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ then there is a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism $X \to \mathcal{G}$ with X a scheme of finite type over S. The morphism $X \to \mathcal{F}$ is then surjective and in $\mathcal{M}$. Let $Y \to \mathcal{H}$ be a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism. Now we have a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism

$$X \times_S Y \to X \times_S \mathcal{H} = X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G},$$

and another surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism

$$X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}.$$

Apply the previous lemma to the composition of these two morphisms, using the property $P4(\mathcal{M})$ of $\mathcal{G}$. We obtain the existence of a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism

$$T \to (X \times_S Y) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_S Y)$$

with T a scheme of finite type over S. On the other hand, note that we have a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism

$$X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X \times_S \mathcal{H} = (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X,$$

and a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism

$$(X \times_S Y) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_S Y) \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}).$$

Composing these three morphisms we obtain a surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphism

$$T \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X.$$

This proves that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$. Let

$$X \to \mathcal{F}, \quad R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$$

be the presentation given by the property $P4(\mathcal{M})$. We may choose X in such a way that there exists a lifting $X \to \mathcal{G}$ (the freedom to replace X by an etale cover comes from Property $M3$ and Lemma 1.9). This gives an isomorphism $X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \cong X \times_S \mathcal{H}$. Let

$$Y \to \mathcal{H}, \quad W \to Y \times_{\mathcal{H}} Y$$

be the presentation given by the property $P4(\mathcal{M})$ of $\mathcal{H}$. We obtain surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphisms

$$X \times_S Y \to X \times_S \mathcal{H}$$

and (defining $U := X \times_S W$)

$$U := X \times_S W \to (X \times_S Y) \times_{X \times_S \mathcal{H}} (X \times_S Y).$$

Put $Z := X \times_S Y$. Then we have surjections in $\mathcal{M}$

$$Z \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}$$

(giving the first part of property $P4(\mathcal{M})$), and

$$U \to Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z.$$

Now,

$$(X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) =$$
$$X \times_{\mathcal{F}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) = (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X) \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G},$$

and we have an $\mathcal{M}$-surjection

$$R \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X) \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}.$$

Since $R \to \mathcal{F}$ lifts to $R \to \mathcal{G}$ we have $R \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} = R \times_S \mathcal{H}$ and letting $V \to R \times_S Y$ be an etale surjection (needed for a certain step below), we obtain $\mathcal{M}$-surjections

$$V \to R \times_S Y \to R \times_S \mathcal{H} \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}).$$

On the other hand,

$$Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z = Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} ((X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G})) \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z$$

so we obtain a surjection in $\mathcal{M}$

$$Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} V \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z \to Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z.$$

We can assume (by choosing V appropriately) that the morphism

$$V \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{F}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G})$$

lifts to a morphism

$$V \to Z \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z.$$

We then have an $\mathcal{M}$-surjection

$$U \times_Z V \times_Z U \to (Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z) \times_Z V \times_Z (Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z)$$

(where the two maps from V to Z used in the fiber product are the two projections composed with $V \to Z \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z$). Note that the right hand side is equal to

$$Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} V \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z,$$

which admits, as we have seen above, an $\mathcal{M}$-surjection to $Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z$. Since $U \times_Z V \times_Z U$ is a scheme of finite type over S, this completes the verification of the property $P4(\mathcal{M})$ for $\mathcal{G}$.

We have now shown the equivalence of the conditions $P4(\mathcal{M})$ for $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. By the lemma, the morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F}$ is in $\mathcal{M}$. By Property $M1$, the structural morphism $\mathcal{F} \to S$ is in $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if the structural morphism $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is. Given the equivalence of the conditions $P4(\mathcal{M})$, this gives equivalence of the conditions $P5(\mathcal{M})$. □

Finally we give a lemma which allows us some flexibility in specifying resolutions.

Lemma 1.11 *Suppose that F is a sheaf on S with surjective $\mathcal{M}$-morphisms $X \to F$ and $R \to X \times_F X$ such that X and R are $P4(\mathcal{M})$. Then F is $P4(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof: Let $X' \to X$ and $Q \to X' \times_X X'$, and $R' \to R$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-surjections given by the hypotheses. We obtain a surjection $X' \to F$ in $\mathcal{M}$. On the other hand, $R' \to X \times_F X$ is in $\mathcal{M}$ and surjective, so

$$X' \times_X R' \times_X X' = R' \times_{X \times_F X} (X' \times_F X') \to X' \times_F X'$$

is an $\mathcal{M}$-surjection. But the left side is equal to

$$(X' \times_X X') \times_{X'} R' \times_{X'} (X' \times_X X')$$

if we choose (as we may assume is possible) a lifting $R' \to X' \times_F X'$ over $X \times_F X$. There is thus a surjection in $\mathcal{M}$

$$Q \times_{X'} R' \times_{X'} Q \to X' \times_X R' \times_X X'.$$

Composing we get the required

$$Q \times_{X'} R' \times_{X'} Q \to X' \times_F X'.$$

□

Stability of the condition $P5(\mathcal{M})$

In the following corollary and theorem we will make use of a supplementary condition on the class $\mathcal{M}$:

M4 If $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a surjective morphism of sheaves of groups, then f is in $\mathcal{M}$.

Corollary 1.12 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies condition M4 in addition to the conditions M1-3. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a $P4(\mathcal{M})$ group sheaf then it is also $P5(\mathcal{M})$.*

Indeed, M4 applied with $\mathcal{G} = \{1\} = S$ gives that the structural morphism $\mathcal{F} \to S$ for any sheaf of groups, is in $\mathcal{M}$. □

Theorem 1.13 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies condition M4 in addition to the conditions M1-3. Then if*

$$1 \to \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{G} \to 1$$

is an extension of group sheaves and if any two of the elements are $P5(\mathcal{M})$, the third one is too.

Proof: Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P5(\mathcal{M})$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is $P5(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if $\mathcal{G}$ is $P5(\mathcal{M})$ (by applying the previous theorem in view of the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ acts freely on $\mathcal{E}$ with quotient $\mathcal{G}$). The remaining case is if $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are $P5(\mathcal{M})$. Then by Lemma 1.6, the kernel $\mathcal{F}$ (which is an equalizer of two maps $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{G}$) is $P4(\mathcal{M})$. By the above corollary, $\mathcal{F}$ is $P5(\mathcal{M})$. □

2. Lifting properties and verticality

We now fill in what class of morphisms $\mathcal{M}$ we would like to use in the theory sketched above. We could, of course, take $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{X}$ to be the full set of morphisms of $\mathcal{X}$. This might well be a reasonable choice, but I don't see how to get a good infinitesimal theory in characteristic zero out of this choice. We could also try, for example, to take $\mathcal{M}$ as the class of flat (or maybe smooth) morphism s. But then any non-flat group scheme over S would be a counterexample to property M4, and as we have seen this property is essential to be able to specify a class of presentable groups closed under kernels, cokernels and extensions. Thus we have to work a little harder to find an appropriate class of morphisms.

We say that a morphism of sheaves $a : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$, is *vertical* (or *$S$-vertical*, if the base needs to be specified), if it satisfies the following lifting properties for all $n \geq 1$:

Suppose Y is a scheme with n closed subschemes $Y_i \subset Y$, with retractions $r_i : Y \to Y_i$—commuting pairwise ($r_i r_j = r_j r_i$)—such that for $j \leq i$, r_i retracts Y_i to $Y_j \cap Y_i$. Suppose given a morphism $Y \to \mathcal{G}$, and liftings $\lambda_i : Y_i \to \mathcal{F}$ such that $\lambda_i|_{Y_i \cap Y_j} = \lambda_j|_{Y_i \cap Y_j}$. Then for any $P \in Y$ lying on at least one of the Y_i there exists an etale neighborhood $P \in Y' \to Y$ and a lifting $\lambda : Y' \to \mathcal{F}$ which agrees with the given liftings $\lambda_i|_{Y_i \times_Y Y'}$ on $Y_i \times_Y Y'$.

For future reference we call this lifting property $Lift_n(Y; Y_i)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism of sheaves which are P2. Then f is vertical if and only if $Lift_n(Y; Y_i)$ holds for all systems $(Y; Y_i)$ with Y (and hence Y_i) artinian.*

Proof: Suppose given a system (Y, Y_i) which is not artinian. Choose a point y_0 (in one of the Y_i) and try to find a lifting in an etale neighborhood of y_0. We can find liftings on $Y^{(n)}$ (the infinitesimal neighborhoods of y_0) by hypothesis. Using the P2 property of $\mathcal{F}$ and an argument similar to that of Theorem 1.3, we can choose a compatible sequence of liftings. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is B2 we obtain a lifting over the spectrum of the complete local ring, then by Artin approximation (using B1) we obtain a lifting on an etale neighborhood of y_0. □

Theorem 2.2 *We have the following statements:*
1. If $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is vertical and if $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G}$ is any morphism of sheaves, then $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is vertical.
2. If $a : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism of sheaves such that for any S-scheme Y and morphism $Y \to \mathcal{G}$, we have that $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y \to Y$ is vertical, then a is vertical;

3. If $a : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ and $b : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ are two morphisms which are vertical, then ba is vertical (also the identity is vertical); and
4. If $a : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ and $b : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ are two morphisms such that a and ba are vertical, and a is surjective, then b is vertical.
5. The etale surjections between schemes are vertical.
6. Any injective morphism $\mathcal{F} \hookrightarrow S$ is vertical.
7. If $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a surjective morphism of sheaves of groups, then f is vertical.

Proof: The lifting property concerns only maps from schemes to $\mathcal{G}$, so it obviously satisfies parts 1 and 2. For part 3, just lift two times successively (for the identity the lifting property is tautological). For part 4, the proof is by induction on n. Keep the notations a, b, $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ of part 4. Suppose $n = 1$. Then we just have to note that if we have a lifting $Y_1 \to \mathcal{G}$ for b, then since a is surjective, we can lift further to $Y_1 \to \mathcal{F}$ (locally in the etale topology). The lifting for ba gives $Y \to \mathcal{F}$ and we just project back to $\mathcal{G}$ to get the lifting for $\mathcal{G}$. This gives the case $n = 1$. We may assume that the present lemma is known when there are strictly fewer than n subschemes. Suppose we have liftings $\lambda_i : Y_i \to \mathcal{G}$; in order to get a lifting λ, and using the lifting property for the morphism ba, it suffices to choose liftings $\mu_i : Y_i \to \mathcal{F}$ with $\mu_i|_{Y_i \cap Y_j} = \mu_j|_{Y_i \cap Y_j}$. We can do this by induction. Suppose we have chosen $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{k-1}$. Since $k - 1 < n$, we know the lemma when there are $k - 1$ subschemes; apply the lifting property for the morphism a with respect to the morphism $Y_k \to \mathcal{G}$, with respect to the subschemes $Y_k \cap Y_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k - 1$, and with respect to the liftings $\mu_j|_{Y_k \cap Y_j}$. We obtain a lifting $\mu_k : Y_k \to \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mu_k|_{Y_k \cap Y_j} = \mu_j|_{Y_k \cap Y_j}$. By induction now we obtain all of the liftings $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n$. The lifting property for ba gives a lifting μ and we can set $\lambda := a\mu$. This completes the verification of part 4.

For the etale surjections (part 5), use the previous lemma. Suppose $i : \mathcal{F} \to S$ is injective (part 6). To verify the lifting property for $Y \to S$ we just have to verify that this morphism factors through $Y \to \mathcal{F}$. For this, use the facts that Y retracts onto Y_1 (over S) and that the morphism $Y_1 \to S$ factors through $Y_1 \to \mathcal{F}$.

Finally we verify $Lift_n(Y, Y_i)$ for the morphism $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ in part 7. Let $r_i : Y \to Y_i$ denote the retractions. Suppose given $\mu : Y \to \mathcal{G}$ and $\lambda_i : Y_i \to \mathcal{F}$ satisfying the necessary compatibility conditions. Since f is surjective, we may suppose that there is a lifting $\sigma : Y \to \mathcal{F}$ of μ (by restricting to an etale neighborhood in Y). We construct inductively $\phi_i : Y \to \mathcal{F}$ lifting μ, with $\phi_i|_{Y_j} = \lambda_j$ for $j \leq i$. Denote the multiplication operations in $\mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{G}$ by $\cdot$. Let

$$h_1 := (\lambda_1 \cdot (\sigma|_{Y_1})^{-1}) \circ r_1 : Y \to \ker(f).$$

Put $\phi_1 := h_1 \cdot \sigma$. Then ϕ_1 restricts to λ_1 on Y_1, and lifts μ. Suppose we have chosen ϕ_i. Let

$$h_{i+1} := (\lambda_{i+1} \cdot (\phi_i|_{Y_{i+1}})^{-1}) \circ r_{i+1} : Y \to \ker(f),$$

and put $\phi_{i+1} := \phi_i \cdot h_{i+1}$. This lifts μ because h_{i+1} is a section of $\ker(f)$. For $j \leq i$, r_{i+1} maps Y_j to $Y_j \cap Y_{i+1}$, and there $\lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_j$ agrees with ϕ_i so $h_{i+1}|_{Y_j} = 1$. We don't destroy the required property for $j \leq i$. On the other hand, we gain the required property for $j = i + 1$, by construction. This completes the inductive step to construct ϕ_i. Finally, the ϕ_n is the lifting required for property $Lift_n(Y, Y_i)$. This completes the proof of part 7. □

From the above results, the class $\mathcal{M}$ of vertical morphisms satisfies the axioms M1, M2, M3, *and* M4 of the previous section. This is the principal class $\mathcal{M}$ to which we will refer, in view of which we

drop $\mathcal{M}$ from the notation when $\mathcal{M}$ is the class of vertical morphisms. Thus the conditions $P4$ and $P5$ refer respectively to $P4(\mathcal{M})$ and $P5(\mathcal{M})$ with $\mathcal{M}$ the class of vertical morphisms.

In particular we obtain the results 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, and 1.13 for the properties P4 and P5.

We have some further results about $P4$ and $P5$.

Lemma 2.3 *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4$. In the situation of the lifting property $Lift_n(Y; Y_i)$ for the morphism $X \to \mathcal{F}$ given by property $P4$, suppose that Y is the scheme-theoretic union of $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$. Then the lifting is unique.*

Proof: In effect, for morphisms $Y \to X$ with X a scheme, if Y is the scheme theoretic union of the Y_i then the morphism is determined by its restrictions to the Y_i. □

Proposition 2.4 *The property of being vertical is stable under base change of S: suppose $p : S' \to S$ is a morphism of schemes. If $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is vertical then $p^*(f) : p^*(\mathcal{F}) \to p^*(\mathcal{G})$ is vertical. Furthermore if $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{K}$ is an S'-vertical morphism of sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/S'$ then the restriction down to S,*

$$Res_{S'/S}(\mathcal{H}) \to Res_{S'/S}(\mathcal{K})$$

is S-vertical.

Proof: This follows from the form of the lifting properties. □

Remark: We often ignore the notation of "restriction down", then the first part of the proposition states that if $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G} \to S$ with the first morphism being S-vertical, then $\mathcal{F} \times_S S' \to \mathcal{G} \times_S S'$ is S'-vertical. The last part of the proposition states that if $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{K} \to S'$ with the first morphism being S'-vertical, then it is also S-vertical.

Corollary 2.5 *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf over S, and suppose $S' \to S$ is a surjective etale morphism such that $\mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ is $P4$ over S'. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4$ over S.*

Proof: If (Y, Y_i) is a system for the lifting property over S, then their pullbacks (Y', Y_i') form such a system over S'. If a morphism of sheaves over S' satisfies the lifting property, then we can lift for the system (Y', Y_i'). This gives a lifting over Y' for the system (Y, Y_i), that is a lifting etale locally, thus satisfying the lifting property over S. Thus a morphism which is S'-vertical is also S-vertical. It follows that $\mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ over S. Now

$$(\mathcal{F}|_{S'}) \times_{\mathcal{F}} (\mathcal{F}|_{S'}) = \mathcal{F}|_{S'} \times_{S'} (S' \times_S S'),$$

and $S' \times_S S'$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ over S. Thus $(\mathcal{F}|_{S'}) \times_{\mathcal{F}} (\mathcal{F}|_{S'})$ is $P4(\mathcal{M})$ over S. We can now apply Lemma 1.11 with $X = \mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ and $R = (\mathcal{F}|_{S'}) \times_{\mathcal{F}} (\mathcal{F}|_{S'})$. □

Presentable group sheaves

In view of the nice properties of $P5$ group sheaves, we make the following change of notation. A sheaf of groups $\mathcal{G}$ over $\mathcal{X}/S$ is a *presentable group sheaf* if it is $P5$. Note that we use this terminology only for sheaves of groups.

Corollary 2.6 *A sheaf of groups which is representable by a scheme of finite type G over S, is presentable.*

Proof: This is because we can take $X = G$ and R equal to the diagonal G in the definition of property $P4$; and property $P5$ is then Corollary 1.12. □

Corollary 2.7 *The category of presentable group sheaves contains the category generated by representable group sheaves under the operations of extensions, kernels, and division by normal subgroups.*

Proof: Theorem 1.13. □

In particular, the category of presentable group sheaves is much bigger than the category of representable group sheaves. I believe that the category of presentable group sheaves is strictly larger than the category generated generated by representable group sheaves under the operations of kernel, cokernel and extension. For example the group sheaves $Aut(V)$ for a vector sheaf V, which are presentable as shown below, are probably not generated from representable group sheaves by kernels, extensions and quotients (although I don't have a counterexample). In an intuitive sense, however, the two categories are about the same.

The two previous corollaries would also hold for the category of $P5(\mathcal{M})$ group sheaves for any class $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying $M1$ through $M4$.

We now give the main argument where we use the lifting properties and the notion of verticality, i.e. the special definition of $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 2.8 *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a sheaf of groups and $X \to \mathcal{G}$ is a vertical surjection, with identity section $e : S \to X$ then (choosing a point P on $e(S)$) there is a lifting of the multiplication to a map of etale germs*

$$\mu : (X, P) \times_S (X, P) \to (X, P)$$

such that $\mu(x, e) = \mu(e, x) = x$.

Proof: Let $Y = X \times_S X$ and $Y_1 = X \times_S e(S) \cong X$ and $Y_2 = e(S) \times_S X \cong X$. We have retractions $Y \to Y_1$ and $Y \to Y_2$ as in the lifting property. The multiplication map $\mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}$ composes to give a map $Y = X \times_S X \to \mathcal{G}$. The identity gives liftings $Y_1 \to X$ and $Y_2 \to X$ agreeing on $Y_1 \cap Y_2 = e(S) \times_S e(S)$. By the definition of verticality of the morphism $X \to \mathcal{G}$, there is an etale neighborhood $P \in Y' \to Y$ and a lifting to a map $Y' \to X$ agreeing with our given lifts on Y_1' and Y_2'. This gives the desired map (note that when we have written the product of two etale germs, this means the germ of the product rather than the product of the two spectra of henselian local rings). □

We use this result in the following way. A map $\mu : X \times X \to X$ (defined on germs at a point P) such that $\mu(e, x) = \mu(x, e) = x$, gives rise to an exponential map $T(X)_e^\wedge \to X$ where $T(X)_e$ is the tangent vector scheme (see §§5-8 below) to X along the identity section e and $T(X)_e^\wedge$ denotes the formal completion at the zero section. To define this exponential map note that the multiplication takes tangent vectors at e to tangent vector fields on X which we can then exponentiate in the classical way. The formal exponential map is an isomorphism between $T(X)_e^\wedge$ and the completion $X^\wedge$ along e. This is a fairly strong condition on X which we will exploit below, notably to get $Lie(\mathcal{G})$ and to develop a theory of connectedness.

In particular this technique allows us to prove directly (in §6 below) that when k is a field of characteristic zero, presentable group sheaves over $Spec(k)$ are just algebraic Lie groups over k.

It is possible that in characteristic p there would be an appropriate notion of verticality taking into account divided powers, which would have the same effect of enabling a good infinitesimal theory. This is why we have left the class $\mathcal{M}$ as an indeterminate in the first part of our discussion above.

The conditions $P3$ and $P3\frac{1}{2}$

We now add the following two conditions, which will be used as conditions on π_0 in the last section (in contrast to the condition $P5$ which is to be used on π_1 and even π_i, $i \geq 2$). These conditions depend on a functorial choice of class $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ of morphisms of sheaves over Y for each $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. We will leave to the reader the (easy) job of stating these properties in this generality, and instead we will state them directly when $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ is taken as the class of Y-vertical morphisms. Note that the properties we are about to state are *absolute* properties of sheaves on $\mathcal{X}$ rather than relative properties of sheaves over some base S.

P3. A sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is $P3$ if there is a surjection $X \to \mathcal{F}$ from a scheme X of finite type over $Spec(k)$, and if there is a surjection $\varphi : R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ from a scheme R of finite type over $Spec(k)$ such that φ is an $X \times X$-vertical morphism.

P3$\frac{1}{2}$. A sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ if there is a surjection $X \to \mathcal{F}$ from a scheme X of finite type over $Spec(k)$, and if there is a surjection $\varphi : R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ from a scheme R of finite type over $Spec(k)$ such that φ is an X-vertical morphism, where the map to X is the first projection of $X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$.

Remark: These properties seem almost identical. The first was refered to in [Si] (already as property $P3$). However it will turn out that the second version (which I hadn't yet thought of at the time of writing [Si]) seems more useful—cf §10 below. The author apologizes for this complication of the notation!

Remark:

$$P5 \Rightarrow P4 \Rightarrow P3\frac{1}{2} \Rightarrow P3 \Rightarrow P2 \Rightarrow P1.$$

These properties will not come into our study of group sheaves over a base S. Rather, they come in as conditions on π_0 of n-stacks on $\mathcal{X}$, in our brief discussion at the end of the paper. In fact we could have put off stating these properties until §10, but the reader had probably been wondering for some time already why we are skipping number 3 in our list of properties.

We quickly give the analogues, for $P3\frac{1}{2}$, of some of the basic facts about our other properties. We leave to the reader the task of elicudating the corresponding properties for $P3$.

Lemma 2.9 *Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ and suppose X is a scheme of finite type with a morphism $X \to \mathcal{G}$. Then there is a surjection from a scheme of finite type $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ which is vertical with respect to the first factor X.*

Proof: Let $Y \to \mathcal{G}$ and $W \to Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y$ be the surjections with the second one being vertical with respect to the first factor Y. There is an etale covering $X' \to X$ and a lifting of our morphism to $X' \to Y$. Then

$$X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X' = (X' \times X') \times_{Y \times Y} (Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y)$$

so

$$R := (X' \times X') \times_{Y \times Y} W \to X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X'$$

is surjective. It is vertical with respect to the first factor Y and hence vertical with respect to the first factor X'. Since $X' \to X$ is etale, this morphism is also vertical with respect to X (via the first factor). The surjection

$$X' \times_{\mathcal{G}} X' \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$$

is the pullback of the etale morphism $X' \times X' \to X \times X$ so it is also vertical with respect to the first factor X. Composing we obtain

$$R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$$

vertical with respect to the first factor. □

Corollary 2.10 *Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ and suppose $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is $P1$ then it is $P3\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof: Let $X \to \mathcal{F}$ be a surjection from a scheme of finite type Y. From the above lemma we get a surjection $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ which is vertical with respect to the first factor, but since $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is injective $X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X = X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ and we're done. □

Corollary 2.11 *Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ is $P2$, then the equalizer $\mathcal{F}$ of any two morphisms $f, g : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ is again $P3\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof: By Lemma 1.6 with $\mathcal{M}$ being the class of all morphisms, we obtain that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P2$ and in particular $P1$. Since it is a subsheaf of $\mathcal{G}$, the previous corollary applies to show that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. □

Corollary 2.12 *Suppose $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ are two morphisms such that $\mathcal{H}$ is $P2$ and $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are $P3\frac{1}{2}$. Then the fiber product $\mathcal{F} \times_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{G}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof: The fiber product is the equalizer of two morphisms $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$. Note that the product of two $P3\frac{1}{2}$ sheaves is again $P3\frac{1}{2}$—this comes from the general statement that if $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is S-vertical and if $\mathcal{A}' \to \mathcal{B}'$ is S'-vertical then $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}' \to \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}'$ is $S \times S'$-vertical (a direct consequence of the form of the lifting properties). □

Finally we have the analogue of one half of Theorem 1.10. I didn't quite see how to do the other half.

Proposition 2.13 *Suppose S is a scheme of finite type, and suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is a group sheaf over S which is $P5$. Suppose that $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is a sheaf and that $\mathcal{H}$ acts freely on $\mathcal{G}$ over S, with quotient $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ then $\mathcal{G}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ (here $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are being considered as the restrictions down to $Spec(k)$ of the corresponding sheaves over S).*

Proof: We follow the proof of the second half of Theorem 1.10. Let

$$X \to \mathcal{F}, \quad R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$$

be the presentation given by the property $P3\frac{1}{2}$. We may choose X in such a way that there exists a lifting $X \to \mathcal{G}$, giving an isomorphism $X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \cong X \times_S \mathcal{H}$. Let

$$Y \to \mathcal{H}, \quad W \to Y \times_{\mathcal{H}} Y$$

be the presentation given by the property $P4(\mathcal{M})$ of $\mathcal{H}$. We obtain surjective S-vertical morphisms

$$X \times_S Y \to X \times_S \mathcal{H}$$

and (defining $U := X \times_S W$)

$$U := X \times_S W \to (X \times_S Y) \times_{X \times_S \mathcal{H}} (X \times_S Y).$$

Put $Z := X \times_S Y$. Then we have a surjection

$$Z \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}$$

and an S-vertical surjection

$$U \to Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z.$$

Now,

$$(X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) =$$
$$X \times_{\mathcal{F}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) = (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X) \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G},$$

and we have a surjection vertical with respect to the first factor X,

$$R \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X) \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}.$$

Since $R \to \mathcal{F}$ lifts to $R \to \mathcal{G}$ we have $R \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} = R \times_S \mathcal{H}$ and letting $V \to R \times_S Y$ be an etale surjection, we obtain surjections

$$V \to R \times_S Y \to R \times_S \mathcal{H} \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}).$$

The first is etale, the second is S-vertical, and the third is X-vertical for the first factor, so the composition is X-vertical. As before

$$Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z = Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} ((X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{G}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G})) \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z$$

so we obtain an X-vertical surjection

$$Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} V \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z \to Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z.$$

We can assume by choosing V appropriately that the morphism

$$V \to (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}) \times_{\mathcal{F}} (X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G})$$

lifts to a morphism

$$V \to Z \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z.$$

We then have an S-vertical surjection

$$U \times_Z V \times_Z U \to (Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z) \times_Z V \times_Z (Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z).$$

The right hand side is equal to

$$Z \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} V \times_{X \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G}} Z,$$

which admits, as we have seen above, an X-vertical surjection to $Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z$. By composing we obtain an X-vertical, and hence Z-vertical surjection

$$U \times_Z V \times_Z U \to Z \times_{\mathcal{G}} Z.$$

This completes the proof. □

3. Functoriality

Suppose F is a sheaf over S, and suppose $\pi : S' \to S$ is a morphism. We denote by $\pi^*(F)$ the restriction $F|_{\mathcal{X}/S'}$, which is the sheaf associated to the presheaf $Y \to S' \mapsto F(Y \to S)$. If F is representable then π^*F is also representable by the fiber product $F \times_S S'$. In general, we allow ourselves to use the notations π^*F, $F \times_S S'$ and $F|_{S'}$ interchangeably.

We have defined, for a sheaf G on S', the *restriction down* $Res_{S'/S}(G)$.

Suppose G is a sheaf on S'. We defined the direct image by

$$\pi_*G(Y \to S) := G(Y \times_S S' \to S').$$

The morphism $F(Y \to S) \to F(Y \times_S S' \to S)$ gives a natural morphism

$$F \to \pi_*\pi^*(F),$$

and the morphism $G(Y \times_S S' \to S) \to G(Y \to S')$ (coming from the graph morphism $Y \to Y \times_S S'$) gives a natural morphism

$$\pi^*\pi_*(G) \to G.$$

These functors are adjoints and the above are the adjunction morphisms. More precisely, we have a natural isomorphism

$$Hom(F, \pi_*G) \cong Hom(\pi^*F, G).$$

This may be verified directly.

Remark: If $f : A \to B$ is a vertical morphism over S' then $\pi_*(f) : \pi_*A \to \pi_*B$ is vertical over S. To see this, note that if $Y, Y^{(n)}$ is a collection of S-schemes with retractions etc. as in the definition of verticality, then $Y \times_S S', Y^{(n)} \times_S S'$ is a collection with retractions over S'. The verticality of $\pi_*(f)$ for the case of $Y, Y^{(n)}$ follows from the verticality of f for the case of $Y \times_S S', Y^{(n)} \times_S S'$.

Remark: Direct and inverse images are compatible with fiber products. For inverse images this is easy. For direct images, suppose we have morphisms $A \to C$ and $B \to C$ on S'. We obtain morphisms $A \times_C B \to A$ and $A \times_C B$ satisfying a universal property. These give morphisms

$$\pi_*(A \times_C B) \to \pi_*A \ \ (resp. \ \ \pi_*B\,).$$

We show the universal property: suppose

$$(u, v) \in (\pi_*A \times_{\pi_*C} \pi_*B)(Y),$$

that is $u \in A(Y \times_S S')$ and $v \in B(Y \times_S S')$ with the same image in $C(Y \times_S S')$. We obtain a unique element of $(A \times_C B)(Y \times_S S')$ mapping to (u, v). This gives the claim.

Lemma 3.1 *if $\mathcal{F}$ is a coherent sheaf on S' and $\pi : S' \to S$ is a finite morphism then $\pi_*(\mathcal{F})$ is a coherent sheaf on S.*

Proof: We may assume S and S' affine, so that $S = Spec(A)$ and $S' = Spec(A')$ with A' a finite A-algebra. The coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ corresponds to an A'-module M. This implies that

$$\pi_*(\mathcal{F})(Spec(B) \to Spec(A)) = \mathcal{F}(Spec(B \otimes_A A'))$$

$$= M \otimes_{A'} (B \otimes_A A') = M \otimes_A B.$$

This formula means that $\pi_*(\mathcal{F})$ corresponds to the same module M considered as an A-module; in particular it is coherent. □

Lemma 3.2 *If F is $P4$ (resp. $P5$) on S then π^*F is $P4$ (resp. $P5$) on S'.*

Proof: Note first of all that S-verticality of a morphism of sheaves over S' implies S'-verticality. Now if F is $P4$, let $X \to F$ and $R \to X \times_F X$ be the corresponding vertical surjections. We get $\pi^*(X) \to \pi^*(F)$ and

$$\pi^*(R) \to \pi^*(X \times_F X) = \pi^*(X) \times_{\pi^*(F)} \pi^*(X),$$

surjective and S-vertical (hence S'-vertical) morphisms. Note that $\pi^*(X)$ and $\pi^*(R)$ are schemes of finite type over S', so we obtain the proof for P3. For $P5$ note that $\pi^*(F) = F \times_S S'$, so by Theorem 2.2, $\pi^*(F) \to S'$ is S-vertical; hence it is S'-vertical as required. □

Lemma 3.3 *Suppose $\pi : S' \to S$ is a finite morphism and suppose G' is a $P4$ sheaf on S'. Then $\pi_*(G')$ is a $P4$ sheaf on S'.*

Proof: Let $X' \to G'$ and $R' \to X' \times_{G'} X'$ be the surjective vertical morphisms with X' and R' schemes of finite type over S'. Let $G := \pi_*(G')$ and similarly for X and R. By the above remark, we obtain vertical morphisms $X \to G$ and $R \to X \times_G X$. (Note that $X \times_G X = \pi_*(X' \times_{G'} X'$ by above.)

In the case of a finite morphism $\pi : S' \to S$, note that if $f : A \to B$ is surjective over S' then $\pi_*(f) : \pi_*A \to \pi_*B$ is surjective. This is a general property of sheaves on the etale topology, for which we sketch the proof (an application of Artin approximation). If $\eta \in \pi_*(B)(Y)$, this means $\eta : Y \times_S S' \to B$. For $y' \in Y \times_S S'$ there is an etale neighborhood $U \to Y \times_S S'$ and a lifting $U \to A$. We need to find an etale neighborhood V of the image $y \in Y$ and a lifting $V \times_S S' \to U$. Define a functor $L(V/Y)$ to be the set of liftings $V \times_S S' \to U$ over $Y \times_S S'$. It is B1, and a lifting exists on $\hat{V} = Spec(\mathcal{O}^{\wedge}_{Y,y})$, so by Artin approximation there is an etale neighborhood V with a lifting.

Applying this to our case, the morphisms $X \to G$ and $R \to X \times_G X$ are surjective. By Lemma 1.11, it suffices to prove that X and R are $P4$. Thus it suffices in general to show: if Z is a scheme of finite type over S' then $\pi_*(Z)$ is $P4$. We make a further reduction: a scheme of finite type can be presented as the kernel of a morphism $\mathbf{A}^n \to \mathbf{A}^m$; the direct image is then the kernel of $\pi_*\mathbf{A}^n \to \pi_*\mathbf{A}^m$. The kernel of a morphism of $P4$ sheaves is again $P4$ (Lemma 1.6) so it suffices to treat the case $Z = \mathbf{A}^n$. But in this case, Z is a coherent sheaf and its direct image is also a coherent sheaf. One can see directly that a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4$ by using the fact that it has a resolution of the form

$$\mathcal{O}^a \to \mathcal{O}^b \to \mathcal{F} \to 0$$

(exact even on the big site $\mathcal{X}/S$), or by looking at Lemmas 4.23 (below) and 3.1. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.4 *Suppose $S' \to S$ is a morphism of schemes of finite type. Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S'$. Then $Res_{S'/S}\mathcal{F}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof: This is only a matter of terminology since, $P3\frac{1}{2}$ being a global property, the statement that $\mathcal{F}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ really means that the restriction of $\mathcal{F}$ down to $Spec(k)$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. It is obviously equivalent to say this after first restricting down to S. □

4. Vector sheaves

With this section we begin the part of our study which requires working over a ground field k of characteristic zero. From now on $\mathcal{X}$ denotes the big etale site of schemes over $Spec(k)$. Before returning to the definition of presentability and its infinitesimal study, we make a detour to discuss *vector sheaves*. These are objects which will be the linearizations of presentable group sheaves—we are also interested in vector sheaves as candidates for the $\pi_i(T,t)$ with $t \in T(S)$, for an n-stack T on $\mathcal{X}/S$ for $i \geq 2$.

To be slightly more precise, suppose $S \in \mathcal{X}$ is a scheme over k, and let $\mathcal{X}/S$ denote the category of schemes over S. We will define a notion of *vector sheaf* on $\mathcal{X}/S$.

This notion is what was called "U-coherent sheaf" by Hirschowitz in [Hi]. The particular case which we call "vector scheme" below has already been well known for some time as the "linear spaces" of Grauert [Gra], appearing notably in Whitney's tangent cones [Wh].

We feel that the terminology "vector sheaf" is more suggestive. Many of the results below seem to be due to Hirschowitz [Hi] (in particular, the observation that duality is involutive) although some parts of the theory are certainly due to [Fis], [Gra], [Wh]. We have integrated these results into our treatment for the reader's convenience. Essentially the only thing new in our treatment is the first lemma (and the analogous statement about extensions).

Before starting in on the definition, I would like to make one note of caution. The category of vector sheaves will not satisfy any nice (ascending or descending) chain condition. This is one of the principal differences with vector spaces or modules over a noetherian ring, and could in the long run pose a major problem if one wants to consider an "infinite dimensional" version of the theory such as by looking at *ind-* or *pro-* objects.

We have a sheaf of rings $\mathcal{O}$ on $\mathcal{X}$, defined by $\mathcal{O}(X) := \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Note that it is represented by the affine line.

Lemma 4.1 *Suppose F is a sheaf of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$, representable by a scheme which is affine and of finite type over S. If there exists a structure of $\mathcal{O}$-module for F, then this structure is unique. If F and G are two such sheaves, and if $a : F \to G$ is a morphism of sheaves of groups, then a is a morphism of $\mathcal{O}$-modules.*

Proof: The first statement of the lemma follows from the second. For the second statement, suppose $u \in F_X$. Consider the element $tu \in F_{X \times \mathbf{A}^1}$. For any positive integer n we have $tu|_{X \times \{n\}} = u + \ldots + u$ (n times). The same is true for the image $a(u)$. Therefore

$$a(tu)|_{X \times \{n\}} = ta(u)|_{X \times \{n\}}.$$

We obtain two morphisms $X \times \mathbf{A}^1 \to G$ which are equal on the subschemes $X \times \{n\}$; this implies that they are equal. (Here is a proof of this: we may suppose that X and the base S are affine, so $X = Spec(A)$ and $G = Spec(B)$ and a morphism $X \times \mathbf{A}^1 \to G$ corresponds to a morphism $\phi : B \to A[t]$. Pick any $b \in B$ and write

$$\phi(b) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} p_j t^j;$$

but the matrix $a_{nj} = n^j$ for $n, j = 1, \ldots, m$ is invertible as a matrix with coefficients in k, so there is a matrix c_{nj} with

$$p_j = \sum_{n=1}^{m} c_{nj} \phi(b)(n).$$

Thus $\phi(b)$ is determined by the values at positive integers $\phi(b)(n)$.) $\square$

A *vector scheme over* S is a sheaf V of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$ which is a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}$-modules and such that there exists an etale covering $\{S_\alpha \to S\}$ such that each $V|_{S_\alpha}$ is representable by a scheme F_α which is affine of finite type over S_α. The above lemma shows that the category of vector schemes is a full subcategory of the category of sheaves of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}$. In the complex analytic category these objects were called "linear spaces" by Grauert and were studied in [Gra], [Fis].

The first remark is that, in fact, the locality in the definition of vector scheme was extraneous. In effect, since the representing schemes F_α are unique up to unique isomorphism, they glue together to give a scheme F, affine and locally of finite type over S.

Lemma 4.2 *Suppose V is a vector scheme on $\mathcal{X}/S$, and suppose S is affine. Then there is an exact sequence*

$$0 \to V \to \mathcal{O}^m \to \mathcal{O}^n$$

of abelian sheaves on $\mathcal{X}$.

Proof: Write $S = Spec(A)$ and $V = Spec(B)$. The action of $\mathbf{G}_m$ gives a decomposition

$$B = \bigoplus B^\lambda$$

where B^λ consists of functions b such that $b(tv) = t^\lambda b(v)$. The sum is over $\lambda \geq 0$ (integers), since the action extends to an action of the multiplicative monoid $\mathbf{A}^1$. Furthermore, if $b \in B^0$ then $b(tv) = b(v)$ for all t (including $t = 0$), in particular $b(v) = b(0)$. Thus $B^0 = A$. If $b \in B^\lambda$ for $\lambda > 0$ then $b(0) = b(0 \cdot O) = 0$. Thus the zero section corresponds to the projection onto $B^0 = A$. The decomposition is compatible with multiplication in B. It is also compatible with the comultiplication $B \to B \otimes_A B$ corresponding to the addition law on V. The comultiplication is

$$B^\lambda \to \bigoplus_{\mu+\nu=\lambda} B^\mu \otimes_A B^\nu,$$

and furthermore the coefficients $B^\lambda \to B^\lambda \otimes_A B^0 = B^\lambda$ and $B^\lambda \to B^0 \otimes_A B^\lambda = B^\lambda$ are the identity (corresponding to the formula $v+0 = v = 0+v$). On the other hand, the composition $B \to B \otimes_A B \to B$ corresponds to the map $v \mapsto v + v = 2v$, which is also scalar multiplication by $t = 2$. Thus the composition

$$B^\lambda \to \bigoplus_{\mu+\nu=\lambda} B^\mu \otimes_A B^\nu \to B^\lambda$$

is equal to multiplication by 2^λ. The first and last terms in the sum give a contribution of $b \mapsto 2b$ (by the observation $v + 0 = v = 0 + v$), so for $\lambda \geq 2$, the composition

$$B^\lambda \to \bigoplus_{\mu+\nu=\lambda, 0<\mu,\nu<\lambda} B^\mu \otimes_A B^\nu \to B^\lambda$$

is multiplication by $2^\lambda - 2$, invertible. Hence every element of B^λ is expressed as a sum of products of elements of B^μ and B^ν for $\mu, \nu < \lambda$. This proves that B^1 generates B as an A-algebra. Since B is of finite type over A (a consequence of the fact that we have supposed all of our schemes noetherian), we can choose a finite number of elements of $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in B^1$ which generate B as an A-algebra, and

these elements give an embedding $V \subset \mathcal{O}^m$. This embedding is linear, since the elements are elements of B^1 (from the above discussion one sees that for $b \in B^1$ we have $b(u+v) = b(u) + b(v)$). Write

$$B = A[x_1, \ldots, x_m]/I$$

for a homogeneous ideal $I = \bigoplus I^\lambda$. We claim that I is generated as an ideal by I^1. To see this, let I' be the ideal generated by I^1 and put $B' = A[x]/I'$. Under the comultiplication of $A[x]$ we have

$$I^1 \to I^1 \otimes_A A \oplus A \otimes_A I^1,$$

so I^1 maps to zero in $B' \otimes_A B'$. Thus so does I'. We obtain a comultiplication

$$B' = A[x]/I' \to B' \otimes_A B',$$

so $Spec(B')$ is a vector scheme too. But the map $B' \to B$ is surjective and an isomorphism on the pieces of degree 1. It is compatible with the comultiplication. We claim that it is injective, showing this on the part of degree λ by induction on λ (starting at $\lambda = 2$). If an element $b \in (B')^\lambda$ maps to zero in B, then by applying the process given above (in the algebra B') we can write $b = \sum b_\mu b_\nu$ for $\mu, \nu < \lambda$. But b_μ and b_ν map to the elements in B given by applying the same process to the image of b; as this image is 0, so are the images of b_μ and b_ν. By the induction hypothesis, the map is injective on the pieces of degrees μ, ν, so $b_\mu = b_\nu = 0$, giving $b = 0$. This induction shows that $B' \cong B$, so $I' = I$ is generated by I^1. Since B is of finite type over A (which is noetherian), I is generated by a finite number of elements. This implies that it is generated by a finite number of elements $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ of I^1. These elements give a linear map $\mathcal{O}^n \to \mathcal{O}^m$, and V is the kernel. □

We come now to the main definition of this section. A *vector sheaf on S* is a sheaf of abelian groups F on $\mathcal{X}/S$ such thatthere exists an etale covering $\{S_\alpha \to S\}$ such that for each α there exists an exact sequence

$$U_\alpha \to V_\alpha \to F|_{S_\alpha} \to 0$$

of sheaves of abelian groups, with U_α and V_α vector schemes over S_α.

Denote by $\mathcal{V}(S)$ the category of vector sheaves over S.

If $X \to S$ is an element of $\mathcal{X}/S$, we denote by $F|_X$ the restriction of F to the category $\mathcal{X}/X$. It is a vector sheaf over X (this is easy to see from the definitions). If F is a vector sheaf and $f \in F(Y)$ and $a : X \to Y$ is a morphism, we denote the restriction of f to X by $a^*(f)$ or just $f|_X$.

Lemma 4.3 *If F is a vector sheaf, and S is an affine variety, then the cohomology groups $H^i(S, F)$ vanish for $i > 0$. If*

$$F_1 \to F_2 \to F_3$$

is an exact sequence of vector sheaves (that is, an exact sequence in the category of abelian sheaves on $\mathcal{X}$, where the elements are vector sheaves) then for any X over S which is itself an affine scheme, the sequence

$$F_1(X) \to F_2(X) \to F_3(X)$$

is exact.

Proof: Treat first the case where F is a vector scheme. We have an exact sequence

$$0 \to F \to \mathcal{O}^a \to \mathcal{O}^b$$

by Lemma 4.2. Let G be the kernel of the morphism $\mathcal{O}^a \to \mathcal{O}^b$ on the small etale site over S. It is a coherent sheaf. Let F' be the sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ whose value on $Y \to S$ is the space of sections of the pullback (of coherent sheaves) of G to Y. There is a surjective morphism $F' \to F$, which induces $F'(U) \stackrel{\cong}{\to} F(U)$ for any U etale over S (or even any U which is flat over S). Let K denote the kernel of $F' \to F$. We claim that if Y is any scheme etale over S, then $H^i(Y, K) = 0$. Prove this by ascending induction on i. If the cohomology in degrees $< i$ of all fiber products of elements in all etale covering families of Y vanishes, then the degree i sheaf cohomology is equal to the degree i Čech cohomology. But the Čech cohomology is calculated only in terms of the values of the sheaf on the fiber products, and here the values of K are zero. Thus $H^i(Y, K) = \check{H}^i(Y, K) = 0$, completing the induction. We obtain $H^i(S, F) = H^i(S, F')$. But the higher cohomology of a coherent sheaf on an affine scheme S vanishes (even in the big etale site). We obtain the desired vanishing. For the second part, suppose that $X = S$ is affine. The restriction of the exact sequence to the small etale site (over X) remains exact. It can be completed to a 5-term exact sequence where the first and last terms are also coherent sheaves; then broken down into short exact sequences. The vanishing of H^1 of coherent sheaves on the small etale site yields the desired exactness of all the short exact sequences of global sections, and hence the exactness of the sequence in question. □

Remark: One can show that a vector sheaf V over an affine S has a resolution by vector schemes, over S rather than over an etale covering of S [Hi].

Lemma 4.4 *Suppose F is a vector sheaf over S. Then for any $X \in \mathcal{X}/S$ and Y a scheme of finite type over k, we have*

$$F(X \times_{Spec(k)} Y) = F(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y).$$

The isomorphism is given by the pullback $F(X) \to F(X \times_k Y)$ and the scalar multiplication by the pullback of functions on Y.

Proof: We first prove this when F is a vector scheme. There is an exact sequence

$$0 \to F \to \mathcal{O}^a \stackrel{M}{\to} \mathcal{O}^b.$$

We have $F(X) = \ker(M(X))$ and $F(X \times_k Y) = \ker(M(X \times_k Y))$. But $\mathcal{O}(X \times_k Y) = \mathcal{O}(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y)$, and $M(X \times_k Y) = M(X) \otimes 1$. Since tensoring over k is exact,

$$\ker(M(X) \otimes 1) = \ker(M(X)) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y)$$

as desired.

Now suppose F is a vector sheaf. There is an exact sequence

$$U \to V \to F \to 0.$$

If Z is affine then the sequence

$$U(Z) \to V(Z) \to F(Z) \to 0$$

remains exact. To see this, replace F by a coherent sheaf F' on the small etale site over Z. The restriction of F to the small etale site over Z is the quotient F' of the restriction of $U \to V$ to the small etale site over Z, that is to say the sections of F and F' are the same on schemes etale over Z (and in particular over Y). But if Z is affine, then taking global sections preserves surjectivity of a morphism of coherent sheaves. This gives the desired exact sequence (proceed in a similar way for

exactness at $V(Z)$). Suppose now that X and Y are affine. Then applying the above to $Z = X$ and $Z = X \times_k Y$ we get

$$U(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y) \to V(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y) \to F(X \times_k Y) \to 0.$$

The first morphism is the same as in the tensor product of

$$U(X) \to V(X) \to F(X) \to 0$$

with $\mathcal{O}(Y)$, so the two quotients are isomorphic: $F(X \times_k Y) \cong F(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y)$. This completes the case where X and Y are affine. But both sides of the equation have the property that they are sheaves in each variable X and Y separately; thus we may first localize on X and then localize on Y, to reduce to the case where X and Y are affine.

Finally, suppose F is a vector sheaf, and write $F = \bigcup_{i \in I} F_i$ as a directed union of vector sheaves. The tensor product of the union is equal to the union of the tensor products:

$$F(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y) = \bigcup_{i \in I} F_i(X) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Y) = \bigcup_{i \in I} F(X \otimes_k Y) = F(X \otimes_k Y).$$

Note that the inclusion maps in the two directed unions are the same (since the isomorphisms established above are uniquely determined by compatibility with the morphisms $F_i(X) \to F_i(X \otimes_k Y)$ and with scalar multiplication by elements of $\mathcal{O}(Y)$). This completes the proof. □

Remark: We will mostly use this lemma in the following two cases. Suppose F is a vector sheaf over S. Then for any $X \in \mathcal{X}/S$ we have $F(X \times \mathbf{A}^1) = F(X) \otimes_k k[t]$. The isomorphism is given by the pullback $F(X) \to F(X \times \mathbf{A}^1)$ and the scalar multiplication by the pullback of the coordinate function t on $\mathbf{A}^1$. Similarly, $F(X \times \mathbf{G}_m) = F(X) \otimes_k k[t, t^{-1}]$, with the isomorphism uniquely determined by compatibility with the previous one under the inclusion $\mathbf{G}_m \subset \mathbf{A}^1$.

Lemma 4.5 *A vector sheaf has a unique structure of $\mathcal{O}$-module, and any morphism of vector sheaves is automatically compatible with the $\mathcal{O}$-module structure.*

Proof: Suppose that $\phi : F \to G$ is a morphism of vector sheaves. Suppose $X \in \mathcal{X}/S$. Suppose $f \in F(X \otimes \mathbf{A}^1)$. The difference $g = \phi(tf) - t\phi(f)$ is an element of $G(X \times \mathbf{A}^1)$ which restricts to zero on $X \otimes \{n\}$ for any integer n. We can write

$$g = \sum_{i=1}^{p} g_i t^i$$

with $g^i \in G(X)$ (by the previous lemma). We know that

$$g(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} g_i n^i = 0$$

for any integer n. But in k the matrix $(n^i)_{1 \le n, i \le p}$ has an inverse (c_{ni}), and we have

$$g_i = \sum_{n=1}^{p} c_{ni} g(n) = 0.$$

Therefore $\phi(tf) - t\phi(f) = g = 0$, for any f. Thus ϕ is compatible with multiplication by t. Now suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(X)$. This gives a morphism $\gamma : X \to X \times \mathbf{A}^1$ such that $\gamma^*(tp_1^*(f)) = \lambda f$ for any $f \in F(X)$ or $G(X)$ (here $p_1 : X \times \mathbf{A}^1 \to X$ is the projection). The fact that ϕ is a morphism of sheaves means that it is compatible with γ^* and p_1^*, so we have

$$\phi(\lambda f) = \phi(\gamma^*(tp_1^*(f))) = \gamma^*(\phi(tp_1^*(f)))$$

$$= \gamma^*(t\phi(p_1^*(f))) = \gamma^*(tp_1^*(\phi(f))) = \lambda\phi(f).$$

Thus ϕ is compatible with scalar multiplication. This fact, applied to the identity of F, implies that the scalar multiplication is unique if it exists.

For existence, note that any morphism of vector schemes is automatically a morphism of $\mathcal{O}$-modules, so the quotient has a structure of $\mathcal{O}$-module. Thus any vector sheaf has a structure of $\mathcal{O}$-module. If F is a vector sheaf expressed as a directed union $F = \bigcup_{i \in I} F_i$ of finite vector sheaves, then the inclusions in the directed union are compatible with the $\mathcal{O}$-module structures; thus the union has an $\mathcal{O}$-module structure. □

The conclusion of this lemma is that the category of vector sheaves, with morphisms equal to those morphisms of abelian sheaves compatible with the $\mathcal{O}$-module structure, is a full subcategory of the category of sheaves of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$.

Next we establish a Krull-type property.

Lemma 4.6 *Suppose that F is a vector sheaf over S, with $f \in F(Y)$, and suppose that for every $X \to Y$ where X is an artinian scheme, $f|_X = 0$. Then $f = 0$. Suppose $\phi : F \to G$ is a morphism of vector sheaves such that for every $X \to S$ with X artinian, $\phi|_X = 0$. Then $\phi = 0$.*

Proof: We work with vector schemes over base schemes which are not necessarily of finite type over k (the definition is the same, but we require additionally that the vector scheme be of finite type over the base). If $U \to V$ is a morphism of vector schemes over a henselian local ring A, and if v is a section of V over A such that for each n there exists $u_n \in U(Spec(A/\mathbf{m}^n))$ with u_n mapping to the restriction of v, then there exists a section u of U over A which maps to v. This follows from the strong Artin approximation theorem at maximal ideals, applied to finding sections of the morphism $U \times_V Spec(A) \to Spec(A)$.

Now onto the proof of the lemma. For the first statement, any section f is contained in a vector subsheaf of F, so we may suppose that F is a vector sheaf. Choose a presentation

$$U \to V \to F \to 0$$

by vector schemes. We may replace X by a covering, so we may suppose that our section f comes from a section v of V. From the previous paragraph, for every henselized local ring A of X, there exists a section u of $U(Spec(A)$ mapping to v. But any such A—henselization at a point P—is the direct limit of algebras A_i etale of finite type over X (which give etale neighborhoods of P), and the space of sections is the direct limit:

$$U(Spec(A)) = \varinjlim U(Spec(A_i)).$$

Thus there is a section u_i over some $Spec(A_i)$ mapping to v. Thus every point P of X has an etale neighborhood on which there is a lifting of v to a section of U. This implies that the image of v in the cokernel F in the etale topology, is zero. This gives the first statement, and the second statement follows easily from this. □

Remark: An alternative to the above proof is to use Lemma 1.4.

The utility of this property comes from the following fact.

Corollary 4.7 *If F is a vector scheme, and if $Y \to S$ is an element of $\mathcal{X}/S$ with Y artinian, then the functor $F_Y : Z \mapsto F(Y \times_{Spec(k)} Z)$ from schemes over $Spec(k)$ to sets, is represented by an additive group scheme (that is, a finite dimensional vector space) over k. This vector space is the k-module $F(Y)$.*

Proof: By Lemma 4.4, we have $F_Y(Z) = F(Y) \otimes_k \mathcal{O}(Z)$ which is the space of morphisms of schemes from Z to the vector space $F(Y)$. Thus F_Y is represented by the vector space $F(Y)$. Note that from the exact sequences used in the proof of Lemma 4.4, $F(Y)$ is a finite-dimensional k-vector space. □

The group scheme $\mathbf{G}_m$ acts on every vector sheaf, by scalar multiplication. This action may be thought of as an action of the functor $\mathbf{G}_m(X)$ on $F(X)$, or as an automorphism of $F(X \otimes \mathbf{G}_m)$ (multiplication by t) which is natural in X. We have seen above that if $F \to G$ is a morphism of sheaves of abelian groups between two vector sheaves, then it is compatible with the $\mathbf{G}_m$ action.

Suppose A is a vector scheme, and F is a vector sheaf. We look at $F(A)$, the space of sections over the scheme A. Let $F(A)^\lambda$ denote the subgroup of elements $f \in F(A)$ such that $f(ta) = t^\lambda f(a)$. Here $a \mapsto ta$ is considered as a morphism $A \times \mathbf{G}_m \to A$ over S, and $f(a) \mapsto t^\lambda f(a)$ is the automorphism of $F(A \times \mathbf{G}_m)$ given by scalar multiplication by $t^\lambda \in k[t, t^{-1}]$; the notation f in the second half of the formula actually denotes the pullback of f to $A \times \mathbf{G}_m$.

Lemma 4.8 *With the above notations, $F(A)$ decomposes as a direct sum*

$$F(A) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbf{Z}, \lambda \geq 0} F(A)^\lambda.$$

This direct sum decomposition is natural with respect to morphisms $F \to G$, and the linear piece $F(A)^1$ is exactly the space of morphisms of vector sheaves $A \to F$.

Proof: Recall that $F(A \times \mathbf{A}^1) = F(A) \otimes_k k[t]$, which we will just write as $F(A)[t]$. The morphism of scalar multiplication $A \times \mathbf{A}^1 \to A$ gives $\Psi_t : F(A) \to F(A)[t]$ defined by $(\Psi_t f)(a) := f(ta)$ (to be accurate, this should be defined in terms of restriction maps for the morphisms involved, but we keep this notation for simplicity). Then $F(A)^\lambda$ is the set of f such that $\Psi_t f = t^\lambda f$ in $F(A)[t]$. Let $\Psi_s[t] : F(A)[t] \to F(A)[s,t]$ denote the extension of $\Psi_s : F(A) \to F(A)[s]$ to the polynomials in t. We have

$$(\Psi_s[t]\Psi_t f)(a) = f(tsa) = (\Psi_{st} f)(a).$$

Write

$$\Psi_t(f) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i(f) t^i,$$

where $\psi_i(f) \in F(A)$ and for any f, there are only a finite number of nonzero $\psi_i(f)$. Our previous formula becomes

$$\sum_{i,j} \psi_i(\psi_j(f)) s^i t^j = \sum_k \psi_k(f)(st)^k.$$

Comparing terms we see that $\psi_i(\psi_j(f)) = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $\psi_i(\psi_i(f)) = \psi_i(f)$. But in general $f \in F(A)^\lambda$ if and only if $\psi_i(f) = 0$ for $i \neq \lambda$ and $\psi_\lambda(f) = f$. Therefore $\psi_i(f) \in F(A)^i$. Restrict to $t = 1$, and

note that the composed morphism $a \mapsto (a,1) \mapsto a$ is the identity so $\Psi_1(f) = f$. We get

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i(f),$$

and this sum is actually finite. Thus every element of $F(A)$ can be expressed as a finite sum of elements of the $F(A)^\lambda$. On the other hand, this expression is unique: if $f = \sum f_i$ with $f_i \in F(A)^i$ then

$$\sum \psi_i(f)t^i = \Psi_t(f) = \sum \Psi_t(f_i) = \sum \psi_i(f_i)t^i = \sum f_i t^i,$$

and comparing coefficients of t^i we get $f_i = \psi_i(f)$. This completes the proof of the decomposition (note that in working with $\mathbf{A}^1$ instead of $\mathbf{G}_m$ we obtain automatically that the exponents are positive).

We have to show that $F(A)^1$ is equal to the space of linear morphisms from A to F. A linear morphism gives an element of $F(A)^1$ (since it is compatible with the action of $\mathcal{O}$ by Lemma 4.5), and the resulting map from the space of morphisms to $F(A)^1$ is injective, since $F(A)$ is the space of morphisms of functors $A \to F$.

Finally, we show surjectivity. For this, suppose given an element $\phi \in F(A)^1$. Suppose Y is artinian, and F is a vector sheaf over S. Then the functor $Z \mapsto F(Y \times Z)$ is represented by a vector space F_Y over k (Lemma 4.7). Our element of $F(A)$ now gives a morphism of schemes $\phi_Y : A_Y \to F_Y$ between these two vector spaces. It is compatible with scalar multiplication, so it is linear. In particular, if $u, v \in A_Y(Spec(k)) = A(Y)$ then $\phi(u+v) = \phi(u) + \phi(v)$ in $F_Y(Spec(k)) = F(Y)$. Now suppose X is any element of $\mathcal{X}/S$. We show that $\phi : A(X) \to F(X)$ is a morphism of abelian groups. Suppose $u, v \in A(X)$. Let $f = \phi(u+v) - \phi(u) - \phi(v) \in F(X)$. By the previous paragraph, for any $Y \to X$ with Y artinian, we have $f|_Y = 0$. But the Krull property of Lemma 4.6 then implies that $f = 0$. This shows that ϕ is a morphism of sheaves of abelian groups. □

If F and G are sheaves of abelian groups, we denote by $Hom(F,G)$ the internal Hom, that is the sheaf of homomorphisms of sheaves of abelian groups from F to G. The value $Hom(F,G)(X)$ is the space of morphisms of sheaves of abelian groups from $F|_{\mathcal{X}/X}$ to $G|_{\mathcal{X}/X}$ (this is already a sheaf).

Corollary 4.9 *If $F \to G$ is a surjection of vector sheaves, and if A is a vector scheme, then the morphism sheaves*

$$Hom(A,F) \to Hom(A,G)$$

is surjective. If X is affine then

$$Hom(A,F)(X) \to Hom(A,G)(X)$$

is surjective.

Proof: It suffices to prove the second statement. We may assume that $X = S$. We have

$$Hom(A,G)(S) = G(A)^1$$

by the last statement of the lemma. Since A is affine, the morphism $F(A) \to G(A)$ is surjective, and by the previous lemma this implies that $Hom(A,F)(S) = F(A)^1 \to G(A)^1$ is surjective, giving the corollary. □

Corollary 4.10 *If $\phi : F \to G$ is a morphism of vector sheaves, then* $\mathrm{coker}(\phi)$ *and* $\ker(\phi)$ *are vector sheaves.*

Proof: We may suppose that S is affine and small enough. Choose presentations by vector schemes (cf the remark before Lemma 4.4)

$$U \to V \to F \to 0$$

and

$$0 \to P \to R \to T \to G \to 0$$

(note that the kernel P is automatically a vector scheme). The morphism $V \to G$ lifts to a morphism $V \to T$, by the previous corollary, and we obtain a presentation

$$R \oplus V \to T \to \mathrm{coker}(\phi) \to 0.$$

The fiber products $V \times_T R$ and $V \times_T R$ are vector schemes, and we have a presentation

$$U \times_T R \to V \times_T R \to \ker(\phi) \to 0.$$

□

Now we have shown that the category of vector sheaves is an abelian subcategory of the category of sheaves of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$.

Suppose A is a vector scheme and F is a vector sheaf. Let $\mathbf{3}$ denote the automorphism of A obtained by multiplication by the scalar 3 (any integer $\neq 0, \pm 1$ will do). We have

$$F(A) = \bigoplus F(A)^\lambda$$

(the decomposition given by Lemma 4.8) where $F(A)^\lambda$ may be characterized as the subspace of elements f such that $\mathbf{3}^*(f) = 3^\lambda f$. In particular, the linear subspace $Hom(A, F) = F(A)^1$ is characterized as the subspace of elements f such that $\mathbf{3}^*(f) = 3f$.

Theorem 4.11 *Suppose E and G are vector sheaves, and*

$$0 \to E \to F \to G \to 0$$

is an extension in the category of sheaves of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$. Then F is a vector sheaf.

Proof: We proceed in several steps. We may assume that S is affine and small enough. Let

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} & & V & & & & B & & \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \\ & & U & & & & A & & \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 \to & E & \to & F & \to & G & & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & & \\ & 0 & & & & 0 & & & \end{array}$$

be presentations for E and G.

Step 1. There exists a lifting of the morphism $A \to G$ to an element $\phi \in F(A)$ with $(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)^2\phi = 0$. The cohomology of E over the affine S is zero, so

$$0 \to E(A) \to F(A) \to G(A) \to 0$$

is exact. Let $\alpha : A \to G$ denote the morphism in the presentation above, and choose $f \in F(A)$ mapping to α. Then write

$$(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)f = \sum e_i$$

with $e_\lambda \in E(A)^\lambda$ (thus $\mathbf{3}^* e_\lambda = 3^\lambda e_\lambda$). Let

$$\phi = f - \sum c_\lambda e_\lambda$$

for $c_\lambda = (3^\lambda - 3)^{-1}$ when $\lambda \neq 1$ (and $c_1 = 0$). We then have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)\phi &= (\mathbf{3}^* - 3)f - \sum c_\lambda(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)e_\lambda \\ &= \sum e_\lambda - \sum c_\lambda(3^\lambda - 3)e_\lambda \\ &= e_1.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)e_1 = 0$, so we get

$$(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)^2\phi = 0.$$

In other words, ϕ is in the generalized eigenspace for the eigenvalue 3 of the transformation $\mathbf{3}^*$.

Step 2. The extension F satisfies the Krull property of Lemma 4.6: if $f \in F(X)$ such that for any artinian $Y \to X$, $f|_Y = 0$, then $f = 0$. Under these hypotheses, f maps to an element $g \in G(X)$ satisfying the same vanishing, so by Lemma 4.6 we have $g = 0$; thus f comes from an element $e \in E(X)$. This element again satisfies the same vanishing, so by Lemma 4.6, $e = 0$.

Step 3. If A is a vector scheme and F is an extension of two vector sheaves, then any element $\phi \in F(A)$ with $(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)^2\phi = 0$ is a morphism of sheaves of abelian groups from A to F. Suppose Y is artinian, and G is a vector sheaf over S. Then the functor $Z \mapsto G(Y \times Z)$ is represented by a vector space G_Y over k. If F is an extension of two finite vetor sheaves E and G, then let F_Y denote the functor $Z \mapsto F(Y \times Z)$. We obtain an extension

$$0 \to E_Y \to F_Y \to G_Y \to 0$$

in the category of sheaves of abelian groups over $Spec(k)$. But since the cohomology of the affine space G_Y with coefficients in the additive group E_Y vanishes, there is a lifting of the identity to a section $u \in F_Y(G_Y)$. Using u we obtain an isomorphism of functors $F_Y \cong E_Y \times G_Y$, so F_Y is a scheme. Since F_Y is a sheaf of abelian groups, F_Y is an abelian group-scheme over k. Since it is an extension of two additive groups, it is additive. Our element of $F(A)$ now gives a morphism of schemes $\phi_Y : A_Y \to F_Y$ between these two vector spaces. We still have $(\mathbf{3}^* - 3)^2)\phi_Y = 0$. But $F_Y(A_Y)$ decomposes into eigenspaces

$$F_Y(A_Y) = \bigoplus F_Y(A_Y)^\lambda$$

where $f \in F_Y(A_Y)^\lambda \Leftrightarrow f(ta) = t^\lambda f(a)$. In particular, $F_Y(A_Y)$ is the 3^λ-eigenspace for $\mathbf{3}^*$. But since the space $F_Y(A_Y)$ is the direct sum of eigenspaces, the generalized eigenspaces are equal to the eigenspaces, so $\phi_Y \in F_Y(A_Y)^1 = Hom(A_Y, F_Y)$. In particular, if $u, v \in A_Y(Spec(k)) = A(Y)$ then $\phi(u + v) = \phi(u) + \phi(v)$ in $F_Y(Spec(k)) = F(Y)$.

Now suppose X is any element of $\mathcal{X}/S$. We show that $\phi : A(X) \to F(X)$ is a morphism of abelian groups. Suppose $u, v \in A(X)$. Let $f = \phi(u+v) - \phi(u) - \phi(v) \in F(X)$. By the previous paragraph, for any $Y \to X$ with Y artinian, we have $f|_Y = 0$. But the Krull property of Step 2 then implies that $f = 0$. This shows that ϕ is a morphism of sheaves of abelian groups.

Step 4. There is a surjection from a vector scheme to F. The direct sum of the morphism $U \to F$ with our lifting $\phi : A \to F$ gives a surjection $U \oplus A \to F \to 0$. In fact, this fits into a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 \to & U & \to & U \oplus A & \to & A & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \to & E & \to & F & \to & G & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & 0 & & 0 & & 0. & \end{array}$$

Step 5. There is a surjection from a vector scheme to the kernel of $U \oplus A \to F$ (proving the theorem). Taking the kernels along the top row of the above diagram gives

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 \to & K & \to & L & \to & M & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \to & U & \to & U \oplus A & \to & A & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \to & E & \to & F & \to & G & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & 0 & & 0 & & 0. & \end{array}$$

But K and M are vector sheaves, and we have surjections $V \to K \to 0$ and $B \to M \to 0$. By repeating the above argument in this case, we obtain a surjection

$$V \oplus B \to L \to 0,$$

finally giving our presentation

$$V \oplus B \to U \oplus A \to F \to 0.$$

Thus F is a vector sheaf. □

Our abelian category $\mathcal{V}$ of vector sheaves is therefore closed under extensions of sheaves of abelian groups.

Duality

Suppose F, G are vector sheaves. We have defined $Hom(F, G)$ which is for now a sheaf of abelian groups. Put

$$F^* := Hom(F, \mathcal{O}).$$

If $\phi : F \to G$ is a morphism of vector schemes, then we obtain a morphism $\phi^t : G^* \to F^*$, and the construction $\phi \mapsto \phi^t$ preserves composition (reversing the order, of course).

Lemma 4.12 (Hirschowitz [Hi]) *Suppose*

$$0 \to U \to V \to W \to F \to 0$$

is an exact sequence with U, V and W vector schemes. Then taking the dual gives an exact sequence

$$0 \to F^* \to W^* \to V^* \to U^* \to 0.$$

Proof: Note first that the compositions are zero, since taking the dual is compatible with compositions (and the dual of the zero map is zero!).

The map $F^* \to W^*$ is injective because $W \to F$ is surjective (so any morphism $F \to \mathcal{O}$ restricting to 0 on W, must be zero).

The morphism $V^* \to U^*$ is surjective: if $a : U \to \mathcal{O}$ is a morphism, it can be interpreted as a section of $\mathcal{O}(U)^1$; but since $U \subset V$ is a closed subscheme, we can extend this to a section $a' \in \mathcal{O}(V)$, then let a'' be the component of a' in $\mathcal{O}(V)^1$; restriction from $\mathcal{O}(V)$ to $\mathcal{O}(U)$ is compatible with the $\mathbf{G}_m$ action, hence with the decomposition of Lemma 4.8, so a'' restricts to a.

Suppose $b : W \to \mathcal{O}$ restricts to zero on V; then it factors through the quotient sheaf $F = W/V$, so it comes from F^*. Thus the sequence is exact at W^*.

We still have to prove exactness at V^*. Choose embeddings $U \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^m$ and $W \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^n$. Then extend the first to a function $V \to \mathcal{O}^m$; combining with the second we obtain $V \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{m+n}$, fitting into a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \to & \mathcal{O}^m & \to & \mathcal{O}^{m+n} & \to & \mathcal{O}^n & \to 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \to & U & \to & V & \to & W & . \end{array}$$

Furthermore, $U = \mathcal{O}^m \cap V$ as subschemes of $\mathcal{O}^{m+n}$ (by the injectivity of $W \to \mathcal{O}^n$). Given a linear map $\lambda : V \to \mathcal{O}$ such that $\lambda|_U = 0$, extend it to $\varphi : \mathcal{O}^{m+n} \to \mathcal{O}$ such that $\varphi|_{\mathcal{O}^m} = 0$. Replace φ by its linear part under the decomposition of Lemma 4.8 (this will conserve the property $\varphi|_{\mathcal{O}^m} = 0$ as well as the property of restricting to λ). Our φ now descends to a map $\mathcal{O}^n \to \mathcal{O}$, restricting to $\varphi|_W$ which extends λ.

Note in the previous paragraph, we have used the following general fact: if $X, Y \subset Z$ are closed subschemes of an affine scheme, and $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ such that $\lambda|_{X\cap Y} = 0$, then there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(Z)$ such that $\varphi|_X = \lambda$ and $\varphi|_Y = 0$. To prove this, let I_X, I_Y and $I_{X\cap Y}$ denote the ideals of X, Y and $X \cap Y$ in the coordinate ring $\mathcal{O}(Z)$. The definition of the scheme-theoretic intersection $X \cap Y$ is that $I_{X\cap Y} = I_X + I_Y$, and our statement follows from the translation that

$$I_Y \to I_{X\cap Y}/I_X \subset \mathcal{O}(Z)/I_X$$

is surjective.

We have completed the proof of the lemma. □

Corollary 4.13 *The functor $F \mapsto F^*$ is an exact functor from the category of finite vector sheaves, to the category of sheaves of abelian groups.*

Proof: Suppose

$$0 \to F' \to F \to F'' \to 0$$

is an exact sequence of vector schemes. Choose presentations

$$0 \to U' \to V' \to W' \to F' \to 0$$

and

$$0 \to U'' \to V'' \to W'' \to F \to 0,$$

and combine these into a presentation

$$0 \to U \to V \to W \to F \to 0$$

with $U = U' \oplus U''$, $V = V' \oplus V''$ and $W = W' \oplus W''$ (using the method of Theorem 4.11, which is easier since we now have the required lifts automatically). These fit together into a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \to & U' & \to & U & \to & U'' & \to & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \to & V' & \to & V & \to & V'' & \to & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \to & W' & \to & W & \to & W'' & \to & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \to & F' & \to & F & \to & F'' & \to & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array}$$

where all the rows and columns are exact. Apply duality to this diagram; we obtain a diagram with the arrows reversed, with the columns exact, by the lemma. Furthermore, the same lemma shows that the upper three rows are exact (in fact, this is easier because the rows in the original diagram are split, by construction). This implies that the bottom row is exact, as desired. □

A *coherent sheaf* is a sheaf which (locally) has a presentation of the form

$$\mathcal{O}^n \to \mathcal{O}^m \to F \to 0.$$

In particular, note that it is a vector sheaf. This coincides with the usual definition: if S is affine and $X \to S$ is a morphism, then $F(X) = F(S) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}(S)} \mathcal{O}(X)$ (this is because the same is true for $\mathcal{O}$, and the presentation remains exact on the right after tensoring).

As usual, we can assume that a presentation as above exists globally over any affine base.

Corollary 4.14 *The dual of a coherent sheaf is a vector scheme and vice-versa.*

Proof: Note that $\mathcal{O}^* = \mathcal{O}$. Taking the dual of a presentation of a coherent sheaf gives

$$0 \to F^* \to \mathcal{O}^m \to \mathcal{O}^n,$$

so F^* is a vector scheme (the kernel here is a closed subscheme of $\mathcal{O}^n$). Conversely, if V is a vector scheme, take an exact sequence such as given in Lemma 4.2, and apply the dual. We obtain a presentation for V^* as a coherent sheaf. □

Corollary 4.15 *The dual of a vector sheaf is again a vector sheaf.*

Proof: If F is a vector sheaf, choose a presentation

$$U \to V \to F \to 0$$

by vector schemes. Taking the dual gives

$$0 \to F^* \to U^* \to V^*.$$

By the previous corollary, U^* and V^* are coherent sheaves, in particular vector schemes. Thus F^* is the kernel of a morphism of vector sheaves, so F^* is a vector sheaf. □

Lemma 4.16 *If F is a vector sheaf, then $F^{**} = F$ (via the natural morphism).*

Proof: If F is a vector scheme, this follows from the construction given in Corollary 4.14: write $F = \ker(M)$ as the kernel of a matrix $M : \mathcal{O}^m \to \mathcal{O}^n$; then $F^* = \mathrm{coker}(M^t)$ is the cokernel of the transpose matrix (and this M^t is really just the transpose, keeping the same coefficients as in M). Finally, $F^{**} = \ker(M^{tt})$, but the transpose of the transpose is the same matrix $M = M^{tt}$, so $F = F^{**}$. (The same argument works for coherent sheaves, of course). If F is any vector scheme, choose a presentation

$$U \to V \to F \to 0$$

and take the double dual. Since $U^{**} = U$ and $V^{**} = V$ we get

$$U \to V \to F^{**} \to 0,$$

so $F^{**} = F$. □

We have now shown that duality is an exact contravariant involution on the category $\mathcal{V}$ of vector sheaves, interchanging vector schemes and coherent sheaves.

Lemma 4.17 *The vector schemes are projective objects in $\mathcal{V}$, and the coherent sheaves are injective objects. There exist enough projectives and injectives (assuming that S is affine).*

Proof: The argument given above shows that a vector scheme A is a projective object: if $F \to G$ is a surjection of vector sheaves then, since A is affine, $F(A)^1 \to G(A)^1$ is surjective. By definition, every vector sheaf admits a surjection from a vector scheme, so there are enough projectives. By duality, the coherent sheaves are injective and there are enough injectives. □

Taking the dual of the three step resolution by vector schemes shows that every vector sheaf F admits a resolution

$$0 \to F \to U \to V \to W \to 0,$$

with U, V and W coherent sheaves (in particular, injective).

Internal Hom and tensor products

We begin with a corollary to the last lemma.

Corollary 4.18 *If A is a vector scheme, then the functor $V \mapsto Hom(A, V)$ from $\mathcal{V}$ to the category of abelian sheaves, is exact. If F is a coherent sheaf, then the functor $V \mapsto Hom(V, F)$ is exact.*

Proof: If S is affine, the functors $V \mapsto Hom(A, V)(S)$ and $V \mapsto Hom(V, F)(S)$ are exact, by the lemma. But the restriction of a vector scheme or a coherent sheaf, to any object $X \in \mathcal{X}/S$ is again a vector scheme or coherent sheaf over X, so we obtain exactness over every affine object; and since exactness is a local condition, we get exactness. □

Lemma 4.19 *If F and G are vector sheaves, then $Hom(F, G)$ is a vector sheaf.*

Proof: Suppose F and G are vector schemes. Then the exact sequence

$$0 \to G \to \mathcal{O}^a \to \mathcal{O}^b$$

yields an exact sequence

$$0 \to Hom(F, G) \to Hom(F, \mathcal{O}^a) \to Hom(F, \mathcal{O}^b);$$

but the middle and right terms are direct sums of the dual F^* which is a vector sheaf, so the kernel $Hom(F, G)$ is a vector sheaf. Now suppose F is a vector scheme and G is a vector sheaf; resolving G by vector schemes we obtain a resolution of $Hom(F, G)$ by vector sheaves, from the previous sentence. Thus $Hom(F, G)$ is a vector sheaf in this case too. Now suppose F is a vector scheme, and choose a resolution

$$U \to V \to F \to 0$$

by vector schemes. The functor $W \mapsto Hom(W, G)$ is contravariant and left exact for any G, so we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \to Hom(F, G) \to Hom(V, G) \to Hom(U, G).$$

The middle and right terms are vector sheaves by the previous arguments, so the kernel is also. This completes the proof in general. □

We now define the *tensor product* $F \otimes^{\mathcal{V}} G$ of two vector sheaves to be

$$F \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} G := (Hom(F, G^*))^*.$$

Beware that this is not just the tensor product of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}$-modules (although this will be the case if F and G are coherent sheaves). We can also define the *cotensor product*

$$F \otimes^{\mathcal{O}} G := Hom(F^*, G).$$

Again, beware here that this is not equal to the tensor product. The difference is seen in noting that the tensor product is right exact as usual, whereas the cotensor product is left exact. (These exactness statements hold in both variables since the tensor and cotensor products are commutative, as we see below). Duality permutes the tensor and cotensor products:

$$(F \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} G)^* = F^* \otimes^{\mathcal{O}} G^*$$

and

$$(F \otimes^{\mathcal{O}} G)^* = F^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} G^*.$$

Define recursively

$$V_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes V_n := V_1 \otimes (V_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes V_n)$$

for either one of the tensor products.

By *multilinear form* $V_1 \times \ldots V_n \to W$ we mean simply a multilinear morphism of sheaves of groups. In the same way as above for the linear morphisms, we obtain a vector sheaf $Mult(V_1 \times \ldots \times V_n, W)$ of multilinear forms (denoted $Bil(\quad)$ when $n = 2$).

Proposition 4.20 *1. There is a natural isomorphism $\alpha_{U,V} : Hom(U^*, V) \cong Hom(V^*, U)$ and $\alpha_{U,V}\alpha_{V,U}$ is the identity.*
2. There is a natural isomorphism

$$Multi(V_1 \times \ldots \times V_n, W) \cong Hom(W^*, Multi(V_1 \times \ldots \times V_n, \mathcal{O}).$$

3. There is a natural isomorphism

$$Multi(V_1 \times \ldots \times V_n, W) \cong Hom(V_1, Multi(V_2 \times \ldots \times V_n, W)).$$

Proof: In each case one defines natural maps in both directions and checks that the two compositions are the identity. □

Theorem 4.21 *Suppose V_i are vector sheaves, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. There is a multilinear form*

$$\mu : V_1 \times \ldots V_n \to V_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \ldots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V_n$$

which is universal in the sense that if

$$\phi : V_1 \times \ldots \times V_n \to W$$

is a multilinear form then there is a unique morphism

$$\psi : V_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \ldots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V_n \to W$$

such that $\phi = \psi \circ \mu$.

Proof: Note first that for $n = 2$ there is a natural bilinear map $U \times V \to Hom(U, V^*)^* = U \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$. Inductively this gives the multilinear map for any n. The universal property says that the induced map

$$Hom(V_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \ldots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V_n, W) \to Multi(V_1, \ldots, V_n, W)$$

should be an isomorphism. We prove this by induction on n, so we may suppose it is true for $n - 1$. By the definition of the multiple tensor product, the quantity on the left is

$$Hom(Hom(V_1, (V_2 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \ldots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V_n)^*)^*, W).$$

By part 1 of the proposition, this is equal to

$$Hom(W^*, Hom(V_1, (V_2 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \ldots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V_n)^*)).$$

By induction, $(V_2 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \ldots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V_n)^* = Multi(V_2 \times \ldots \times V_n, \mathcal{O})$. Coupled with part 3 of the proposition we get

$$Hom(W^*, Multi(V_1 \times \ldots \times V_n, \mathcal{O})$$

which then is equal to the right hand side above, by part 2 of the proposition. □

Corollary 4.22 *The tensor and cotensor products have natural commutativity and associativity isomorphisms satisfying the usual constraints.*

Proof: For the tensor product this follows from the universal property and the fact that the notion of multilinear form is independent of the order of the variables. For the cotensor product this follows because it is the dual of the tensor product. □

We can define symmetric and exterior powers, either with respect to the tensor product or with respect to the cotensor product. Let S_n denote the symmetric group on n objects. Let $V^{\otimes_{\mathcal{O}} n}$ (resp. $V^{\otimes^{\mathcal{O}} n}$) denote the tensor product (resp. cotensor product) of n copies of a vector sheaf V. Then S_n acts on $V^{\otimes_{\mathcal{O}} n}$ (resp. $V^{\otimes^{\mathcal{O}} n}$) because of the commutativity and associativity. This representation is completely reducible (this can be see object-by-object). The components are vector sheaves; this can be seen by noting that the fixed part is the kernel of a morphism of vector sheaves (the direct sum of $1-\gamma$ for $\gamma \in S_n$); to get the other components, apply that to tensor products with the irreducible representations of S_n. The trivial component of $V^{\otimes_{\mathcal{O}} n}$ (resp. $V^{\otimes^{\mathcal{O}} n}$) is denoted by $Sym^n_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$, the symmetric power (resp. $Sym^{\mathcal{O}}_n(V)$, the symmetric copower). The component corresponding to the sign representation is denoted by $\bigwedge^n_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$, the exterior power (resp. $\bigwedge^{\mathcal{O}}_n(V)$, the exterior copower).

Remark: There is a natural morphism $U \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V \to U \otimes^{\mathcal{O}} V$, that is to say

$$Hom(U, V^*)^* \to Hom(U^*, V).$$

However, this is not an isomorphism. A counterexample can be constructed by looking for a case where the cotensor product is left exact but not right exact (and noting that the tensor product is right exact), or vice-versa.

We have the expression $U \otimes^{\mathcal{O}} V = Bil(U^* \times V^*, \mathcal{O})$. The inequality mentionned above implies in particular that there are bilinear functions on $U^* \times V^*$ which are not sums of tensors $u \otimes v$. This is a big difference from the case of schemes (for example if U and V are coherent so that U^* and V^* are vector schemes, then the bilinear functions *are* sums of tensor products.

Automorphisms of vector sheaves

We end our discussion of vector sheaves by showing how they give examples of presentable group sheaves.

Lemma 4.23 *If V is a vector sheaf over S, then V is presentable.*

Proof: Suppose V is a vector scheme. Then taking $X = V$ and $R = V \times_V V = V$ we obtain the required presentation (note that the identity morphisms are vertical)—so V is $P4$, and then $P5$ by Corollary 1.12. It follows from Theorem 1.10 that the quotient of one vector scheme by another is again $P5$; and finally that the quotient of a vector scheme by such a quotient is $P5$. In view of the 3-stage resolution of any vector sheaf by vector schemes, we obtain the lemma. □

One of the main examples of presentable group sheaves is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 4.24 *Suppose V is a vector sheaf over S. Then the group sheaf $Aut(V)$ is a presentable.*

Proof: By the previous lemma and Lemma 4.19, $Hom(V, V)$ is $P5$. We can express

$$Aut(V) \subset Hom(V, V) \times Hom(V, V)$$

as the equalizer of the two morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Hom(V,V)\times Hom(V,V) & \to & Hom(V,V)\times Hom(V,V) \\ (a,b) & \mapsto & (ab,ba) \\ (a,b) & \mapsto & (1,1). \end{array}$$

Apply Lemma 1.6 to obtain that $Aut(V)$ is $P4$, and then Corollary 1.12 to obtain that it is $P5$. □

A particular case of this construction is when V is a coherent sheaf which we denote by $\mathcal{F}$. There is a presentation

$$U_2 \stackrel{\phi}{\to} U_1 \to \mathcal{F} \to 0$$

where $U_i = \mathcal{O}^{a_i}$. Let $Aut(U_2, U_1, \phi)$ denote the group sheaf of automorphisms of the morphism $U_2 \to U_1$. Any such automorphism gives an automorphism of $\mathcal{F}$ so we have a morphism

$$Aut(U_2, U_1, \phi) \to Aut(\mathcal{F}).$$

Lemma 4.25 *This morphism is a surjection onto $Aut(\mathcal{F})$, and $Aut(U_2, U_1, \phi)$ is represesentable by a group scheme over S.*

Proof: The representability by a group scheme is clear, since $Aut(U_i)$ are group schemes (isomorphic to $GL(a_i)$) and the condition of compatibility with ϕ is a closed condition so $Aut(U_2, U_1, \phi)$ is a closed subscheme of $Aut(U_1) \times Aut(U_2)$.

Suppose $S' \to S$ is a scheme and $P \in S'$ is a point. Suppose $\eta : \mathcal{F}|_{S'} \to \mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ is an automorphism. Let

$$U_2' \stackrel{\phi'}{\to} U_1' \to \mathcal{F}|_{S'} \to 0$$

be a minimal resolution of $\mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ at the point P (that is to say that the value $\phi'(P)$ is identically zero and the rank of U_2' is minimal). Then there are locally free $W_i \cong \mathcal{O}^{b_i}$ on S' such that $U_i|_{S'} \cong U_i' \oplus W$ and such that the map $\phi|_{S'}$ can be written in block form with respect to this decomposition, with a morphism ψ' in the block of the W_i and the map ϕ' in the block of the U_i', such that ψ' is surjective. Our morphism η extends to a morphism of resolutions $U_\cdot' \to U_\cdot'$ which is an isomorphism near P by the minimality of the resolution (in fact the values $U_i'(P)$ are the $Tor^i_{\mathcal{O}_{S'}}(\mathcal{F}|_{S'}, k_P)$ and an isomorphism of $\mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ induces an isomorphism on the Tor^i). We can complete this with the identity in the block of the W_i to get an isomorphism of resolutions $U_i|_{S'}$ inducing η. This gives the desired surjectivity. □

Question: Does a similar result hold for the automorphisms of any vector sheaf?

5. Tangent sheaves of presentable sheaves

Suppose $S' \to S$ is an S-scheme. Put

$$Y := S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3]/(\epsilon_i^2, \epsilon_i\epsilon_j))$$

with the subschemes

$$Y_i := S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_i]/(\epsilon_i^2))$$

and

$$Y_{ij} := S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j]/(\epsilon_i^2, \epsilon_j^2, \epsilon_i\epsilon_j)).$$

Note that $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup Y_3$, and $Y_{ij} = Y_i \cup Y_j$, as well as $Y_i \cap Y_k = S' \subset Y$ and $Y_{ij} \cap Y_{jk} = Y_j$ (for $i \neq k$). It should be stated explicitly that Y_{ij} is the closed subscheme defined by the ideal (ϵ_k), $k \neq i, j$; and Y_i is the closed subscheme defined by the ideal (ϵ_j, ϵ_k), $j, k \neq i$.

We need a weaker version of the notion of verticality. We say that a morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ of sheaves is *T-vertical* if it satisfies the lifting property $Lift_2(Y_{ij}; Y_i, Y_j)$ and $Lift_3(Y; Y_{12}, Y_{23}, Y_{13})$ (for any S'). Note that these systems satisfy the retraction hypotheses in the lifting property, so the property of T-verticality is weaker than the property of verticality.

The result of Theorem 2.2 holds also for T-verticality, so the class $\mathcal{T}$ of T-vertical morphisms satisfies the axioms M1-M4. In particular the properties $P4$ and $P5$ imply $P4(\mathcal{T})$ and $P5(\mathcal{T})$ respectively.

The advantage of th weaker property of T-verticality is that if $X \to Z$ is a morphism of schemes over S, then it is T-vertical. To prove this, note that the properties $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup Y_3$, $Y_{ij} = Y_i \cup Y_j$, $Y_i \cap Y_k = S' \subset Y$ and $Y_{ij} \cap Y_{jk} = Y_j$ mean that for defining morphisms from Y to a scheme (or from Y_{ij} to a scheme) it suffices to have compatible morphisms on the Y_{ij} or on the Y_i.

(*Caution:* We did not include the lifting condition $Lift_1(Y_1; S')$ in the notion of T-verticality; morphisms of schemes do not necessarily satisfy this lifting property!)

The conclusion of the previous paragraph and property $M1$ for T-verticality is that if $\mathcal{F}$ is a $P4(\mathcal{T})$ sheaf then the structural morphism $p : \mathcal{F} \to S$ is T-vertical; thus $P4(\mathcal{T}) \Leftrightarrow P5(\mathcal{T})$.

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism of $P4$ sheaves. Then f is T-vertical. Furthermore, the liftings in the lifting properties for f, for the systems $(Y_{ij}; Y_i, Y_j)$ and $(Y; Y_{12}, Y_{23}, Y_{13})$, are unique.*

Proof: For T-verticality, we can choose vertical surjections $X \to \mathcal{F}$ and $Y \to \mathcal{G}$ so that there is a lifting $X \to Y$. This lifting is T-vertical since it is a morphism between schemes (cf the above remark). Hence the composition $X \to \mathcal{G}$ is T-vertical. By Theorem 2.2, part 4 for T-verticality, applied to the composition $X \to \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$, we obtain T-verticality of the morphism f.

To prove the uniqueness, note that liftings to schemes are unique since $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup Y_3$ and $Y_{ij} = Y_i \cup Y_j$. Then descend the uniqueness down from X to $\mathcal{F}$ where $X \to \mathcal{F}$ is the vertical (hence T-vertical) morphism provided by the property $P4$. This descent of the uniqueness property is immediate from the lifting property for $X \to \mathcal{F}$. □

In the statement of the following theorem, the condition is $P4$ and not $P4(\mathcal{T})$ (i.e. that isn't a misprint).

Theorem 5.2 *Suppose $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism of $P4$ sheaves on S. Suppose $u : S \to \mathcal{F}$ is a section. Then the relative tangent sheaf $T(f)_u$ over S, defined by*

$$T(\mathcal{F})_u(b : S' \to S) := \{\eta : S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \to \mathcal{F} \ : \quad f\eta = fubp_1 \ \text{ and } \ \eta|_{S'} = ub\},$$

has a natural structure of sheaf of abelian groups making it a vector sheaf.

Proof: We first define the natural abelian group structure on this sheaf. Suppose

$$\eta_i : S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_i]/(\epsilon_i^2)) \to \mathcal{F}$$

are sections of $T(f)_u$ over S' $(i = 1, , \ldots, 3)$. (*Nota:* for the definition of the group law we only need $i = 1, 2$; we need $i = 1, 2, 3$ only to check that it is associative.) Here (and below) we attach various subscripts to the variables ϵ. Use the notations established above:

$$Y := S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3]/(\epsilon_i^2, \epsilon_i\epsilon_j))$$

with the subschemes

$$Y_i := S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_i]/(\epsilon_i^2))$$

and

$$Y_{ij} := S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j]/(\epsilon_i^2, \epsilon_j^2, \epsilon_i\epsilon_j)).$$

Note that $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup Y_3$, and $Y_{ij} = Y_i \cup Y_j$. Again Y_{ij} is the closed subscheme defined by the ideal (ϵ_k), $k \neq i, j$; and Y_i is the closed subscheme defined by the ideal (ϵ_j, ϵ_k), $j, k \neq i$. The systems $(Y_{ij}; Y_i, Y_j)$ and $(Y; Y_{12}, Y_{23}, Y_{13})$ satisfy a unique lifting property for the morphism f (Lemma 5.1). Note that $Y_{ij} \cap Y_{jk} = Y_j$ (for $i \neq k$). We apply this first to the system $(Y_{ij}; Y_i, Y_j)$. There is a unique morphism

$$\eta_{ij} : Y_{ij} \to \mathcal{F}$$

over the base morphism $Y_{ij} \to S \to \mathcal{G}$ and agreeing with η_i (resp. η_j) on Y_i (resp. Y_j). Let

$$\delta_{ij} : S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \to Y_{ij}$$

be the diagonal and—for future use—let

$$\delta_{123} : S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \to Y$$

be the triple diagonal. Then we put

$$\eta_i + \eta_j := \eta_{ij} \circ \delta_{ij}.$$

This gives a composition which is obviously commutative (the definition is symmetric in the two variables). To check that it is associative, apply unique lifting for (Y, Y_{ij}) to get a unique $\eta_{123} : Y \to \mathcal{F}$ restricting to the η_{ij} on Y_{ij}. Next, note that the triple diagonal is equal to the composition of $1 \times \delta_{23}$ with the diagonal

$$S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon_0]/(\epsilon_0^2)) \to Spec(k[\epsilon_1, \epsilon]/(\epsilon_1^2, \epsilon^2, \epsilon_1\epsilon)).$$

Using this, we get

$$\epsilon_1 + (\eta_2 + \eta_3) = \eta_{123} \circ \delta_{123}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$(\epsilon_1 + \eta_2) + \eta_3 = \eta_{123} \circ \delta_{123},$$

giving associativity.

The identity element (which we denote by 0) is the composition

$$S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)) \to S \to \mathcal{F}.$$

This construction is natural: if

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F} & \to & \mathcal{F}' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{G} & \to & \mathcal{G}' \end{array}$$

is a diagram with vertical arrows vertical, and if $u : S \to \mathcal{F}$ is a section projecting to $u' : S \to \mathcal{F}'$, then composition with the morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}'$ respects the conditions in the definition of the tangent sheaves, and so it gives a morphism $T(f)_u \to T(f')_{u'}$. The addition we have defined is natural, so this morphism of tangent sheaves respects the addition (it also respects the identity).

The inverse is obtained by applying the automorphism $\epsilon \mapsto -\epsilon$. This completes the construction of the natural structure of sheaf of abelian groups.

Next, we show that if

$$\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{b} \mathcal{H}$$

is a sequence of morphisms of $P4$ sheaves, and if $u : S \to \mathcal{F}$ is a section, then we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to T(a)_u \to T(ba)_u \to T(b)_{au}$$

We certainly get such a sequence with the composition being zero. Furthermore, $T(a)_u$ is the subsheaf of $T(ba)_u$ consisting of those elements projecting to zero in $T(b)_{au}$ (this follows immediately from the definition).

Furthermore, if a is vertical, then the sequence is exact on the right. This follows from the lifting property in the definition of vertical, in view of the fact that S' is a retraction of $S' \times Spec(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2))$. (Note that we have not required this lifting property in the definition of T-verticality.)

Let $p : \mathcal{F} \to S$ denote the structural morphism for a $P4$ sheaf $\mathcal{F}$, and define the tangent sheaf $T(\mathcal{F})_u := T(p)_u$. If $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ is a morphism of $P4$ sheaves, the exact sequence of the previous paragraph becomes

$$0 \to T(f)_u \to T(\mathcal{F})_u \to T(\mathcal{G})_{fu}.$$

Again, if f is vertical then this sequence is exact on the right also.

Finally, we show that if $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4$ then $T(\mathcal{F})_u$ is a vector sheaf. The above exact sequence implies that if f is a morphism of $P4$ sheaves then $T(f)_u$ is a vector sheaf. Let $f : X \to \mathcal{F}$ be the vertical morphism given by the property $P4$. Since the question is etale local on S, we may assume that our section $u : S \to \mathcal{F}$ lifts to a section $v : S \to X$. We have an exact sequence

$$0 \to T(f)_v \to T(X)_v \to T(\mathcal{F})_u \to 0.$$

Note that $T(X)_v$ is a vector scheme (an easy thing to see—it is given by the linear parts of the equations of X at the section v).

Let $g : R \to X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X$ be the other vertical morphism given by the property $P4$.

We claim that we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to T(X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X)_{(v,v)} \to T(X)_v \oplus T(X)_v \to T(\mathcal{F})_u \to 0.$$

To see this, note that an element of $T(X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X)_{(v,v)}$ consists of an element of $T(X \times_S X)_{(v,v)}$ mapping to $T(\mathcal{F})_u \subset T(\mathcal{F} \times_S \mathcal{F})_{(u,u)}$. Note that

$$T(X \times_S X)_{(v,v)} = T(X)_v \oplus T(X)_v,$$

and

$$T(\mathcal{F} \times_S \mathcal{F})_{(u,u)} = T(\mathcal{F})_u \oplus T(\mathcal{F})_u$$

with the map from $T(\mathcal{F})_u$ being the diagonal. The quotient of $T(\mathcal{F} \times_S \mathcal{F})_{(u,u)}$ by the diagonal $T(\mathcal{F})_u$ is thus isomorphic to $T(\mathcal{F})_u$ and we obtain the exact sequence in question. The surjectivity on the right is from surjectivity of $T(X)_v \to T(\mathcal{F})_u$.

Lift (v, v) to a section $w : S \to R$. The exact sequence for g gives a surjection

$$T(R)_w \to T(X \times_{\mathcal{F}} X)_{(v,v)} \to 0.$$

Combining this with the above exact sequence, we obtain the right exact sequence

$$T(R)_w \to T(X)_v \oplus T(X)_v \to T(\mathcal{F})_u \to 0.$$

Since $T(R)_w$ and $T(X)_v$ are vector schemes, this shows that $T(\mathcal{F})_u$ is a vector sheaf. □

6. The case $S = Spec(k)$

We now analyse the definitions of the previous sections in the case where the base scheme is $S = Spec(k)$ (a hypothesis we suppose for the rest of this section).

Caution: We will use throughout this section certain properties of vertical morphisms etc. which hold only in the context $S = Spec(k)$. The reader should not extrapolate these properties to other cases.

Our first lemma is a preliminary version of the next lemma which we include because the argument may be easier to understand in a simpler context.

Lemma 6.1 *Suppose $f : X \to Spec(k)$ is morphism of finite type. Then f is vertical if and only if f is a smooth morphism.*

Proof: Suppose X is smooth. Then the required lifting properties hold. Indeed, X is etale locally a vector space, and Theorem 2.2 (part 7) implies that vector spaces are vertical over $Spec(k)$.

Conversely, suppose f is vertical, and suppose $x \in X$. The first claim is that for any $v \in T(X)_x$ there is a smooth germ of curve $(C, 0)$ mapping to (X, x) with tangent vector v at the origin. Since X is of finite type, and by Artin approximation, it suffices to construct a compatible family of morphisms

$$\gamma_n : Spec(k[t]/t^n) \to X$$

sending $Spec(k)$ to x and with tangent vector v (that is, the map γ_2 represents v). Before starting the construction, choose a morphism

$$\mu : X \times X \to X$$

with $\mu(x, y) = \mu(y, x) = y$ for any y (the possibility of finding μ follows from the definition of verticality). We now construct γ_n by induction, starting with γ_2 given by v. Suppose we have constructed γ_n by the inductive procedure. Let $Y(n) := Spec(k[r]/r^n) \times Spec(k[s]/s^2)$. The composition gives a morphism

$$\phi_n := \mu \circ (\gamma_n, \gamma_2) : Y(n) \to X.$$

We will show that ϕ_n factors through the morphism

$$d : Y(n) \to Spec(k[t]/t^{n+1})$$

which is dual to the morphism

$$k[t]/t^{n+1} \to k[r, s]/(r^n, s^2)$$
$$t \mapsto r + s.$$

We will then choose γ_{n+1} equal to the resulting morphism $Spec(k[t]/t^{n+1}) \to X$, that is with $\phi_n = \gamma_{n+1} d$. Since γ_n restricts to γ_{n-1}, and since we have chosen γ_n by the inductive procedure, we have that

$$\phi_n|_{Y(n-1)} = \phi_{n-1} = \gamma_n d.$$

Writing $X = Spec(A)$ (in a neighborhood of x) the morphism ϕ_n corresponds to

$$\phi_n^* : A \to k[r, s]/(r^n, s^2).$$

We have that $\phi_n^*(a)$ reduces modulo r^{n-1} to $d^* \gamma_n^*(a)$. Writing

$$\gamma_n^*(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j t^j$$

we have

$$\phi_n^*(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j (r+s)^j + \alpha r^{n-1} + \beta r^{n-1} s.$$

Write, on the other hand, the equation $\phi_n|_{Spec(k[r]/r^n)} = \gamma_n$. We get that

$$\phi_n^*(a) \sim \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j r^j \mod(s).$$

This gives $\alpha = 0$ in the above equation. Finally, note that $(r+s)^n = nr^{n-1}s$ modulo (r^n, s^2). Thus we may set $b_n := \beta/n$ and get

$$\phi_n^*(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} b_j (r+s)^j.$$

Put

$$\gamma_{n+1}^*(a) := \sum_{j=0}^{n} b_j t^j,$$

and we get the desired factorization $\phi_n = \gamma_{n+1} d$. This completes the inductive step for the construction of the γ_n. We obtain the desired formal curve and hence a curve $(C, 0)$ as claimed.

Remark: Intuitively what we have done above is to integrate the vector field on X given by the tangent vector v and the multiplication μ. Of course, the curve C is an approximation to the integral curve, which might only exist formally.

The next step in the proof of the lemma is to choose a collection of vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ generating $T(X)_x$, and to choose resulting curves $C_1, \ldots, C_m$. Using the map μ in succession (or applying directly the definition of verticality) we obtain a map

$$\Phi : (U, 0) := (C_1 \times \ldots \times C_m, 0) \to (X, x),$$

inducing the given morphisms on the factors C_i (considered as subspaces of the product by putting the origin in the other places). By construction the differential $d\Phi_0$ is given by the vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m$, in particular it gives a surjection

$$d\Phi_0 : T(U)_0 \to T(X)_x \to 0.$$

Note that U is smooth of dimension m. We claim that this implies $dim_x(X) \geq dim T(X)_x$. To see this, let $d := dim_x(X)$ and $n := dim T(X)_x$. By semicontinuity, the dimension of the fiber $\Phi^{-1}(x)$ at the origin is at least equal to $m - d$. In particular, the tangent space to the fiber has dimension at least $m - d$; but this gives a subspace of dimension $m - d$ of $T(U)_0$ which maps to zero in $T(X)_x$; by the surjectivity of $d\Phi_0$ we get $n \leq m - (m - d) = d$, the desired inequality.

Finally, it follows from this inequality that X is regular at x and hence smooth at x (and, of course, the inequality is an equality!). This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 6.2 *Suppose X and Y are schemes of finite type over k and $f : X \to Y$ is a morphism. Then f is $Spec(k)$-vertical if and only if f is smooth.*

Proof: Note first that if f is smooth then it is etale-locally a product with affine space so we get all of the lifting properties. Suppose now that f is vertical. If $Q \in Y$ and $P \in f^{-1}(Q)$ then $Lift_1(Y,Q)$ implies that, after replacing Y by an etale neighborhood of Q we may suppose that there is a section $\sigma : Y \to X$ with $\sigma(Q) = P$. Let $T(X/Y)_\sigma$ denote the relative tangent vector scheme along the section σ. It is easy to see that the morphism $T(X/Y)_\sigma \to Y$ is $Spec(k)$-vertical. We then obtain that the morphism

$$\Gamma(Y, T(X/Y)_\sigma) \to (T(X/Y)_\sigma)_Q = T(f^{-1}(Q))_P$$

is surjective, and this then implies that $T(X/Y)_\sigma$ is a vector bundle over Y. The same argument as in the previous lemma allows us to "exponentiate" in a formal neighborhood of P, to get a map φ from $T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$ (the formal completion in a neighborhood of $0(Q)$) to X, which sends the zero section 0 to σ and whose tangent map is the identity along σ.

We claim that if S' is artinian local with a morphism $S'' \to X$ sending the origin to P, then the morphism factors via φ through a map $S' \to T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$ sending the origin to $0(Q)$. Prove this claim using the standard deformation theory argument by induction on the length of S': suppose $S'' \subset S'$ is defined by an ideal I annihilated by the maximal ideal, and suppose we know the claim for S''. Then there exists a map $S' \to T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$ extending the known map on S'' since $T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$ is a vector bundle over Y. The space of such extensions is a principal homogeneous space over $I \otimes_k (T(X/Y)_\sigma)_Q$ whereas the space of extensions of $S'' \to X$ to morphisms $S' \to X$ is a principal homogeneous space over $I \otimes_k T(f^{-1}(Q))_P$. The map φ induces an isomorphism

$$(T(X/Y)_\sigma)_Q \cong T(f^{-1}(Q))_P$$

so there is an extension to a map $S' \to T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$ which projects to our given map $S' \to X$. This proves the claim.

Now we can prove that $X \to Y$ is formally smooth at P. If $S'' \subset S'$ are artinian local and if $a : S' \to Y$ is a map lifting over S'' to a map $b : S'' \to X$ sending the origin to P, then we get (from the previous claim) that the map b factors through a map $S'' \to T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$. Since $T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$ is a vector bundle and in particular smooth over Y, this extends to a map $S' \to T(X/Y)^\wedge_\sigma$. This extension projects into X to an extension $S' \to X$ of the map b. This shows formal smoothness. Since X and Y are of finite type, f is smooth. □

Corollary 6.3 *Suppose G is a presentable sheaf of groups on $\mathcal{X}/Spec(k)$ (which is equal to $\mathcal{X}$ in this case), and suppose $f : X \to G$ is a vertical morphism. Then X is smooth over $Spec(k)$.*

Proof: The morphism $G \to Spec(k)$ is vertical by Theorem 2.2 (7). The composed morphism $X \to Spec(k)$ is vertical hence smooth by Lemma 6.1. □

Theorem 6.4 *If G is a presentable group sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/Spec(k)$ then it is represented by a smooth separated scheme of finite type over k (in other words it is an algebraic Lie group over k).*

Proof: We assume $k = \mathbf{C}$ for this proof. Choose vertical surjections $f : X \to G$ and $R \to X \times_G X$. Note that $R \to G$ is vertical, so X and R are smooth schemes of finite type. By adding some factors of affine spaces we can assume that the components of X and R all have the same dimension. By the previous section, the morphism $df : T(X) \to f^*T(G)$ is a morphism of vector sheaves on X, hence it is a morphism of vector bundles. It is surjective, so the kernel is a strict sub-vector bundle $\mathcal{F} \subset T(X)$. For each $x \in X$ we have

$$\mathcal{F}_x := \ker(T(X)_x \to T(G)_{f(x)}).$$

The morphism $p_1 : R \to X$ is vertical (since $X \times_G X \to X$ is the pullback of the vertical $X \to G$ by the morphism $X \to G$, and p_1 is the composition of the vertical $R \to X \times_G X$ with this projection). Therefore, by Lemma 6.2 p_1 is smooth. Suppose $r \in R$ maps to $(x, y) \in X \times X$. Let $g \in G$ denote the common image of x and y. We have an exact sequence

$$T(R)_r \to T(X)_x \oplus T(X)_y \to T(G)_g \to 0.$$

From this we get that the image of the map on the left always has the same dimension; in particular this shows that the map $T(R) \to (p_1, p_2)^* T(X \times X)$ is strict. For any point g in G we can identify $T(G)_g \cong T(G)_1$ by left multiplication. The morphism on the right in the exact sequence then comes from a morphism of the form $p_1^*(\alpha) - p_2^*(\alpha)$ where $\alpha : T(X) \to T(G)_1$ is obtained from the differential of f by the left-multiplication trivialization. This morphism is a morphism of vector bundles from the tangent bundle of $X \times X$ to the constant bundle $T(G)_1$, so its kernel is a distribution in the tangent bundle of $X \times X$. The image of R is an integral leaf of this distribution. In particular, the image of R is a smooth complex submanifold of $X \times X$ (note that the map from R to the leaf is smooth since, by the above exact sequence, the differential is surjective at any point—this implies that the image is open in the leaf).

Choose a subvariety $X' \subset X$ which is everywhere transverse to the distribution $\mathcal{F}$, and which meets every subvariety of X of the form $p_2(p_1^{-1}(x))$ for p_i denoting the projections $R \to X$. We may assume that X' is of finite type. Let R' be the intersection of $X' \times X'$ with the image of R in $X \times X$. We claim that the morphism $X' \to G$ is surjective and vertical, and that $R' = X' \times_G X'$. To see this, note that by hypothesis $X' \times_X R \to X$ is surjective on closed points. By our transversality assumptions this morphism is also smooth. Thus any point in X is equivalent via R (etale-locally) to a point in X'. For verticality, it suffices to prove that $X' \times_G X \to X$ is vertical (Theorem 2.2, parts 3 and 4). And for this it suffices to note that $X' \times_X R \to X' \times_G X$ is surjective and vertical (being the pullback of $X \times_X R \to X \times_G X$ by $X' \times_G X \to X \times_G X$), that $X' \times_X R \to X$ is smooth and hence vertical, and to apply Theorem 2.2, part 4. We get $X' \to G$ surjective and vertical. If we put R'' equal to the pullback of R to $X' \times X'$ then $R'' \to X' \times_G X'$ is surjective and vertical (it being also the pullback of R via $X' \times_G X' \to X \times_G X$). The previous proof applied to this case shows that R'' is smooth over its image R', and that R' is a smooth subvariety of $X' \times X'$. But now, by our previous transversality assumptions, the projections $R' \to X'$ are etale.

We can now conclude that G, which is the quotient of X' by the equivalence relation R', is a smooth algebraic space. We will find an open subset $U \subset G$ which is a smooth variety over k. In order to do this, let d be the maximum number of points in the fibers of $X' \to G$. The fiber through a point x is equal to $p_2(p_1^{-1}(x))$ where $p_i : R' \to X'$ here denote the projections. Let $W \subset X$ be the set of points x where the maximum number d of points in the fiber $p_1^{-1}(x)$ is achieved. Since the morphism $p_1 : R' \to X$ is etale, it is easy to see that W is an open subset, and that if we let R'_W denote $p_1^{-1}(W)$ then $R'_W \to W$ is a finite etale morphism of degree d. On the other hand, if $x \in W$ and y is in the fiber through x then y is also in W. This means that $p_2(R'_W) \subset W$. The correspondence

$$x \mapsto p_2(p_1^{-1}(x))$$

gives a morphism χ from W to the symmetric product $W^{(d)}$ having image in the complement of the singular locus. Then $W \times_{W^{(d)}} W = R'_W$. In particular, the quotient of W by the equivalence relation R'_W is the image of χ. Note that χ is etale over its image, which is thus a locally closed subscheme of $W^{(d)}$. This shows that the quotient of W by the equivalence relation is a scheme U of finite type. It is also smooth. The morphism $W \to G$ factors through $U \to G$.

We claim that the morphism $U \to G$ is an open subfunctor, that is for any $Y \to G$ the fiber product $U \times_G Y$ is an open subset of Y. The fiber product is the quotient of $W \times_G Y$ by the induced equivalence relation; and the quotient of $X' \times_G Y$ by the equivalence relation is equal to Y. Choosing local liftings $Y \to X'$ we find that $X' \times_G Y$ is the image of $R' \times_{X' \times X'} (X' \times Y) \to X' \times Y$, that is it is the pullback of R'. In particular it is a subscheme of $X' \times Y$. This subscheme surjects to Y by a vertical morphism, a morphism which is hence smooth. The image of the open subset $W \times_G Y$ (which is the intersection of $X' \times_G Y$ with $W \times Y$) is therefore an open set in Y. This shows that $U \subset G$ is an open subfunctor.

We can choose a finite number of elements $g_i \in G(S)$ such that $g_i \cdot U$ cover G. For the finiteness use the surjection $X \to G$ with X of finite type (in particular, quasi-compact).

We now apply Grothendieck's theorem about representability which says that if a functor G is a sheaf (in the Zariski topology, which is the case here since Zariski is coarser than etale), and if it is covered by a finite number of open subfunctors G_i which are representable by schemes, then the functor G is representable by a scheme (the union of the schemes G_i). In our case the G_i are the $g_i \cdot U$, representable by U. Since U is of finite type, the union of a finite number of copies is again of finite type.

We obtain that G is a scheme of finite type. Note that U is smooth so G is smooth (alternatively, use that any group scheme is smooth). To complete the proof we just have to show that G is separated. Note first that all connected components of G must have the same dimension, so we can speak of the dimension of G without problem. Let $\Delta \subset G \times G$ denote the diagonal. It is preserved by the diagonal left action of $G(k)$ on $G \times G$ (that is, the action $g(a,b) = (ga, gb)$). The complement $K := \overline{\Delta} - \Delta$ is a closed subset of $G \times G$, of dimension strictly smaller than the dimension of G. But K is invariant under the diagonal left action of $G(k)$, so its image $pr_1(K) \subset G$ is invariant by the left action of $G(k)$. Since $dim(K) < dim(G)$ the image $pr_1(K)$ (which is a constructible subset of dimension $\leq dim(K)$) is not dense in G. On the other hand, if K were nonempty then this image, being left invariant, would contain a right translate of $G(k)$ which is Zariski dense. This contradiction implies that K is empty, in other words G is separated. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Application: Suppose S is any base scheme of finite type over $Spec(k)$ now, and suppose $S' \to S$ is an artinian scheme of finite type. Let $\pi : S' \to Spec(k)$ denote the structural morphism. If G is a presentable group sheaf over S the pullback $G|_{S'}$ is presentable (Lemma 3.2) and the direct image $\pi_*(G|_{S'})$ is presentable over $Spec(k)$ (Lemma 3.3). By Theorem 6.4, $\pi_*(G|_{S'})$ is represented by a group scheme of finite type which we denote $G_{S'}$ over k. We have

$$G(S') = G_{S'}(Spec(k)).$$

Furthermore, if $X \to G$ is a vertical surjection then we obtain a scheme of finite type $X_{S'} = \pi_*(X|_{S'})$ with a morphism $X_{S'} \to G_{S'}$. This morphism is smooth.

7. Local study of presentable group sheaves

In this section we return to the case of general base scheme S (in particular, the hypothesis $S = Spec(k)$ is no longer in effect).

First we establish some notations for formal completions. Suppose G is a presentable group sheaf. Let $\widehat{G}$ denote the sheaf which associates to $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ the set of values in $G(Y)$ which restrict to the identity on Y^{red}. More generally, use the same notation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ whenever $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf with a given section playing the role of the identity section (usually the section in question is understood from the context).

Local structure

Lemma 7.1 *Suppose G is a presentable group over a base S. Suppose $Z \to G$ is a vertical surjection with Z an affine scheme of finite type over S. Let $T(Z)_e \to S$ be the tangent vector scheme at a lift e of the identity section. For any $s \in S$ there is an etale neighborhood*

$$e(s) \in W \stackrel{p}{\to} Z$$

and an etale S-morphism $q : U \to TZ$, such that $q = p$ over the section e (which maps to the zero section of TZ).

Proof: Verticality of $Z \to G$ means that we can choose a lifting of the multiplication of G to $m : Z \times Z \to Z$ such that $m(x, e) = x$ and $m(e, y) = y$.

Let $Q : Z \to Z$ be the automorphism $Q(x) := m(x, x)$. It has the effect of multiplication by 2 on the tangent scheme TZ at the identity section, because

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} m(x, x)(e) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} m(x, e) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} m(e, x)(e) = 2\frac{\partial x}{\partial x} = 2.$$

If we embedd $Z \subset \mathbf{A}^N_S$ as a closed subscheme with the identity section going to the origin-section, then we may extend Q to a morphism $Q' : \mathbf{A}^N_S \to \mathbf{A}^N_S$ such that Q' acts by multiplication by two on the tangent space at the origin. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{A}^N_S}$ denote the formal completion of the affine space along the origin-section. Then Q' induces an automorphism of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}^N_S}$, and it is well known—and easy to see using power series—that such an automorphism is conjugate to its linear part (since the eigenvalues are different from 1). We obtain an automorphism $F : \widehat{\mathbf{A}^N_S} \to \widehat{\mathbf{A}^N_S}$ such that $F^{-1} \circ Q' \circ F = 2$. Let $\widehat{Z} \subset \widehat{\mathbf{A}^N_S}$ be the closed formal subscheme obtained by completing Z at the identity section. Note that $\widehat{Z}$ is preserved by Q'. Thus the image $F(\widehat{Z})$ is a formal subscheme which is preserved by multiplication by 2. It follows that it is a cone, and in particular that the linear parts of the equations defining $F(\widehat{Z})$ vanish on $F(\widehat{Z})$. This means that $F(\widehat{Z})$ is included in its tangent scheme $T(F(\widehat{Z}))$ along the identity section. Translating back by F we obtain an immersion

$$\widehat{Z} \hookrightarrow TZ$$

which is the identity on the tangent space at the identity section. The image is a closed formal subscheme preserved by scalar multiplication.

For any artinian scheme S' over S, $Z(S')$ is a smooth scheme over $Spec(k)$ and $\widehat{Z(S')} \subset TZ(S')$ is a closed formal subscheme at the origin, with the same Zariski tangent space, and which is formally preserved by scalar multiplication. Therefore $\widehat{Z(S')} \cong T\widehat{Z(S')}$. Now $\widehat{Z}(S')$ is the inverse image of $e \in Z(\widehat{Spec}(k))$ via the map

$$\widehat{Z(S')} \to Z(\widehat{Spec}(k)).$$

The same is true for the tangent scheme TZ. From these properties we get that $\widehat{Z}(S') \to \widehat{TZ}(S')$ is an isomorphism for any S'.

As that holds true for all artinian schemes S' over S we get that the morphism $\widehat{Z} \to \widehat{TZ}$ is an isomorphism. Artin approximation now gives the existence of such an isomorphism (inducing the same map on tangent schemes along the identity section) over an etale neighborhood in Z, as required for the lemma. □

We need to develop a suitable theory of the connected component of a presentable group sheaf G.

Theorem 7.2 *If G is a presentable group sheaf over S, then there is a unique subsheaf of groups $G^0 \subset G$ such that G^0 is presentable and such that for any artinian S-scheme S', we have $G^0(S')$ equal to the connected component of $G(S')$ (when these are considered as algebraic groups over the ground field of S'—cf the application at the end of the section on the situation over $Spec(k)$).*

Proof: We first show existence. Let $Z \to G$ be a vertical surjection with Z a scheme of finite type. Let $\sigma : S \hookrightarrow Z$ be the identity section. We claim that there is an open neighborhood $U \subset Z$ of $\sigma(S)$ such that for any artinian S-scheme S', $U(S')$ is connected. By Lemma 7.1, there is an etale neighborhood of the zero section $W \to TZ$ and another etale morphism $W \to Z$ giving an etale neighborhood of the section σ. We claim that (possibly throwing out a closed subset of W not meeting the section) we can assume that the $W(S')$ are connected. In what follows we refer to the lifting of the zero section of TZ as the section σ of W.

For any given S', artinian located at $s \in S$, there is a surjection of vector spaces

$$(TZ)(S') \to V_i \subset (TZ)(s),$$

for some subspace V_i which depends on S'. If $W \to TZ$ is our etale morphism, then we have

$$W(S') = W(s) \times_{TZ(s)} (TZ)(S') = W(s) \times_{TZ(s)} V_i \times_{V_i} (TZ)(S'),$$

since a point $S' \to TZ$ has a unique lifting to W once the lifting is specified on the closed point. Thus $W(S')$ is connected if and only if, for all subspaces $V_i \subset (TZ)(s)$ we have that $W(s) \times_{TZ(s)} V_i$ is connected.

Let $Gr(TZ) \to S$ be the disjoint union of the grassmanian schemes of subspaces of different dimensions. It is proper over S. We have a universal subscheme

$$\mathcal{V} \subset Gr(TZ) \times_S TZ.$$

Note that the map $\mathcal{V} \to TZ$ is proper. Let $\tilde{W} := W \times_{TZ} \mathcal{V}$; this is an etale covering of $\mathcal{V}$, and is proper over W. Let $\tilde{W}^N \subset \tilde{W}$ be the union of the connected components in fibers which do not pass through the section σ (relative to $Gr(TZ)$). Note that $\tilde{W}^N$ is a constructible subset of $\tilde{W}$ (one can see this by noetherian induction). Let $W^N \subset W$ be the image of $\tilde{W}^N$. It is again a constructible subset. A point $w \in W$ is in W^N if and only if there exists a vector subspace $V_i \subset (TZ)(s)$ such that w is in a different connected component of $V_i \times_{TZ} W$ from $\sigma(s)$. In particular, if we choose an analytic neighborhood of the section σ which is isomorphic to a tubular neighborhood of the zero-section of TZ, then this analytic neighborhood doesn't meet W^N. Thus there is a Zariski open neighborhood of σ not meeting W^N. Since taking a Zariski open subset doesn't affect connectivity (the schemes $W_{S'}$ in question being smooth), we may replace W by this open subset and hence assume that W^N is empty. From the discussion of the previous paragraph, this implies that the $W_{S'}$ are connected, proving the first claim.

Let U be the image of W in Z. Note that the set-theoretic image is an open set and is equal to the image of the functor, since $W \to Z$ is etale.

Let $\eta : Z \times_S Z \to Z$ be a lifting of the multiplication map $(g, h) \mapsto gh$ such that $\eta(z, 1) = z$ and $\eta(1, z) = z$. We claim that the composition law $Z \times_S Z \to G$ is a vertical morphism. Note that $Z \times_S Z \to G \times_S G$ is vertical, so it suffices to prove that the composition $G \times_S G \to G$ is vertical. For this, notice that there is an isomorphism $G \times_S G \cong G \times_S G$ sending (a, b) to (ab, b), and which

interchanges the multiplication and the first projection. Since the first projection is vertical (this comes from the fact that $G \to S$ is vertical), we obtain that the composition law is vertical, yielding the claim.

By Lemma 1.9, there exists a vertical surjection

$$R \to (Z \times_S Z) \times_G (Z \times_S Z)$$

with R a scheme of finite type. Let $G^0 \subset G$ be the image of the morphism $U \times_S U \to G$. Then the morphism $U \times_S U \to G^0$ is a vertical surjection, and we have a vertical surjection

$$R' \to (U \times_S U) \times_{G^0} (U \times_S U)$$

obtained by letting R' be the inverse image of $(U \times_S U) \times_{G^0} (U \times_S U)$ in R. Note that R' is also equal to the fiber product

$$U \times_S U \times_S U \times_S U \times_{Z \times_S Z \times_S Z \times_S Z} R,$$

so R' is a scheme of finite type over S.

We claim that for any artinian S', the $G^0(S')$ is equal to the connected component of $G(S')$. To see this, note first of all that $G^0(S')$ is connected (since it is the image of $U(S') \times U(S')$ which is connected). And secondly, note that the morphism

$$Z(S') \to G(S')$$

is an open map (this is a map of smooth varieties—cf the section on what happens over a field and in particular the application at the end). Therefore the image of $U(S')$ is an open subset $V \subset G(S')$. It is connected since $U(S')$ is connected. The image of $(U \times_S U)(S')$ is equal to the image of the multiplication map $V \times V \to G(S')$. It is easy to see that if V is a connected Zariski open subset of an algebraic group over a field (containing the identity), then the image of the multiplication map is a subgroup. Thus $G^0(S')$ is a subgroup of $G(S')$. It contains an open neighborhood of the identity and it is connected, so it is equal to the connected component. We claim now that G^0 is a sheaf of subgroups of G. If $g, h \in G^0(S')$ then the product gh restricts into $G^0(S'')$ for any artinian ring S'' over S'. The sheaf G^0 is P2, hence it is B1 and B2 (Theorem 1.3). The inverse image of the section gh by the morphism $G^0 \to G$ is again B1 and B2. This inverse image is nonempty artinian S''. By Artin approximation, the inverse image has a section locally over S', and since this section is unique if it exists, it gives a section $gh \in G^0(S')$.

We have now shown existence of G^0 as required by the theorem. For uniqueness, suppose that G^1 were another candidate. Then G^0 and G^1 are both B1 and B2 subsheaves of G having the same points over artinian S'. Artin approximation implies that they are equal. □

We say that a presentable group sheaf G is *connected* if $G = G^0$. The above theorem immediately gives the characterization that G is connected if and only if $G(S')$ is connected for all artinian S'.

Corollary 7.3 *We have the following properties.*
1. If G is connected then any quotient group of G is connected;
2. Of G and H are connected then any extension of G by H is connected;
3. If G is a connected group sheaf over a base S and if $Y \to S$ is any morphism of schemes then $G|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}$ is a connected group sheaf over Y; and
4. If $f : Y \to S$ is a finite morphism and if G is a connected group sheaf over Y then $f_*(G)$ is a connected group sheaf over S.
5. If G is any presentable group sheaf then the connected component G^0 is the largest connected presentable subgroup.

Proof: Items 1-3 are immediate from the characterization. To prove 4 note that if $S' \to S$ then $f_*(G)(S') = G(Y \times_S S')$ and $Y \times_S S'$ is artinian, so this latter group is connected, thus by the above characterization $f_*(G)$ is connected. To prove 5 note that if H is any connected subgroup of G then $H(S') \subset G^0(S')$ for all artinian S', hence $H \subset G^0$. □

Finite presentable group sheaves

We say that a presentable group sheaf G is *finite* if $G^0 = \{1\}$. If G is any presentable group sheaf, then the connected component G^0 is a normal subgroup sheaf, and the quotient $C := G/G^0$ is again presentable. Over artinian S', this quotient is just the group of connected components, in particular the connected component is trivial. Thus C is finite.

Lemma 7.4 *If G is a finite presentable group sheaf, then there is an integer N such that for any henselian local S-scheme S' (with algebraically closed residue field), the number of elements in $G(S')$ is less than or equal to N.*

Proof: We first treat the case where S' is artinian local with algebraically closed residue field. Let $Z \to G$ and $R \to Z \times_G Z$ be the vertical surjections given by the fact that G is $P4$. There is an etale neighborhood $U \to Z \times_S Z$ of the diagonal such that U is isomorphic to an etale neighborhood of the zero section in the total scheme TZ (and this isomorphism is compatible with the first projection to Z). This is seen as in the argument above. Furthermore, as above we may assume that the fibers of the first projection $U \to Z$ are connected (over any artinian scheme). Then for any artinian scheme $S' \to U$, the two elements of $G(S')$ obtained from the two projections $U \to Z$ are the same, by the hypothesis that G is finite. (To see this, compare $(a, b) : S' \to U$ with $(a, a) : S \to U$; they are in the same fiber over a, and this fiber is connected, so they have to have the same image in $G(S')$.) Thus, any artinian subscheme of U lifts into R. This implies that there is (locally in the etale topology) a lifting $U \to R$. Let $V \subset Z \times_S Z$ be the image of U. It is a Zariski neighborhood of the diagonal, and locally there is a lifting from V into R. Let $F \subset Z \times_S Z$ be the reduced closed subscheme corresponding to the closed subset which is the complement of V. Suppose $Y \to S$ is an artinian local scheme (with acrf). If $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ is an n-tuple of distinct points of $G(Y)$, then there is a lifting $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in Z \times_S \ldots \times_S Z(Y)$ such that for any i, j we have that $(a_i, a_j) : Y \to Z \times_S Z$ is not contained in V. In particular, the reduced point $(a_i, a_j)^{\mathrm{red}}$ is contained in F. Thus the reduced point $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)^{\mathrm{red}}$ is contained in the closed subscheme

$$F^{(n)} := \bigcap_{i,j} pr_{ij}^{-1}(F) \subset X \times_S \ldots \times_S X.$$

We claim that there is an n such that $F^{(n)}$ is empty. For any $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in F^{(k)}$, let

$$\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) := \{y \in X, \ \ \pi(y) = \pi(x_i) \in S, \ \ (y, x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in F^{(k+1)}\}.$$

Note that these are closed subschemes of X with strict inclusions

$$\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \subset \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}).$$

Furthermore, $\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ varies algebraically with $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$.

Let $d = dim(X)$ and let $\Lambda = \mathbf{N}^d$ with the lexicographic ordering giving the most importance to the dth coordinate. For any algebraic set Y of dimension $\leq d$, let $\lambda(Y) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ be defined by setting

λ_d equal to the number of irreducible components of dimension d. Note that if $Y' \subset Y$ is a strict inclusion of a closed subset then $\lambda(Y') < \lambda(Y)$. Let $\Lambda^{(k)}$ be the finite set of all $\lambda(\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k))$ for $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in F^{(k)}$ (it is finite because $\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ varies algebraically with $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$). Introduce an order relation on subsets $\Sigma \subset \Lambda$ by saying

$$\Sigma < \Sigma \Leftrightarrow \forall \sigma \in \Sigma, \exists \sigma' \in \Sigma', \ \sigma < \sigma'.$$

Then the sequence $\Lambda^{(k)}$ is a sequence of finite subsets which is strictly decreasing for this order relation. We claim that this implies (by combinatorics) that one of the $\Lambda^{(k)}$ is empty. To see this, assume that the combinatorial claim is true for $d-1$. We will show that the set of upper bounds for λ_d on $\Lambda^{(k)}$ doesn't stabilize. If it were to stabilize after k_0 at a certain y, then for $k \geq k_0$ we could let $A^k \subset \mathbf{N}^{(d-1)}$ be the subset of elements $(a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1})$ such that $(a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}, y) \in \Lambda^{(k)}$. We obtain a strictly decreasing sequence of subsets for the case of $d-1$, so it is eventually empty, meaning that in fact the upper bound for λ_d didn't stabilize. A decreasing sequence which doesn't stabilize can't exist, so eventually there is no upper bound, in other words $\Lambda^{(k)}$ becomes empty. This gives the claim.

Since one of the $\Lambda^{(k)}$ is empty, one of the $F^{(k)}$ is empty. Let N be chosen so that $F^{(N)}$ is empty (and consequently $F^{(k)}$ is empty for $k \geq N$). Then by the above argument, if $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ is an n-tuple of distinct points of $G(Y)$, we must have $n < N$. This gives the theorem in the case of an artinian local Y.

Now suppose A is a henselian local ring and $S' = Spec(A)$. Let $S'_n := Spec(A/\mathbf{m}_A^n)$. In the inverse system $\lim_{\leftarrow} G(S'_n)$ we have that all of the $G(S'_n)$ have cardinality bounded by N. In particular, the cardinality of the inverse limit is bounded by N. Now suppose that there are $N+1$ distinct points y_i in $G(S')$. Two of the points go to the same point in $\lim_{\leftarrow} G(S'_n)$, which means that for two of the points, the liftings $z_i, z_j \in Z(S')$ give a point (z_i, z_j) in $Z \times_S Z$ which lifts, over any S'_n, into R. By strong artin approximation (check here !!!), the point (z_i, z_j) must lift into R so the two points in $G(S')$ are equal, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Corollary 7.5 *If G is a presentable group sheaf, then G is finite if and only if $G(S')$ is finite for any henselian (resp. artinian) S'.*

Proof: The lemma provides one direction. For the other, note that if $G(S)$ is finite for artinian S' then $G^0(S') = \{1\}$. By unicity in the characterization of G^0 we get $G^0 = \{1\}$. □

8. Local study of presentable subgroups

In this section we show that if $H \subset G$ is a presentable subgroup of a presentable group G then locally at the identity, in an appropriate sense, H is defined by the vanishing of a section of a vector sheaf. This is a generalisation of the basic result that a subgroup of an algebraic group is smooth, and hence a local complete intersection—cut out by a section of its normal bundle. We obtain this result only in a "neighborhood of the identity", or more precisely upon pullback by a vertical morphism $X \to G$ such that X admits a lift of the identity. If Y is a scheme with morphism $Y \to G$ such that $P \in Y$ maps to the identity section in G, then there will be an etale neighborhood of $P \in Y$ lifting to X (which is why we can think of X as a neighborhood of the identity).

This result will be used in a future study of de Rham cohomology (results announced in [Si]). There, it will be important to have a structure theory for presentable subgroups because of the general principle that if G is a presentable group sheaf then $G/Z(G) \subset Aut(\mathcal{L})$ where $\mathcal{L} = Lie(G)$ is

the Lie algebra vector sheaf of G (see §9 below). A good understanding of the structure of presentable subgroups will allow us to reduce to looking at de Rham cohomology with coefficients in $Aut(\mathcal{L})$ for $\mathcal{L}$ a vector sheaf, and here we have a more concrete hold on what happens.

Theorem 8.1 *Suppose G is a connected presentable group sheaf over S, and suppose $H \subset G$ is a presentable subgroup sheaf. Suppose that $X_1 \to G$ is a vertical morphism with lift of the identity section $e : S \to X_1$. Suppose $P \in S$. Then there is an etale neighborhood $X \to X_1$ of $e(P)$ with a lift of the identity $e : S \to X$ (possibly after localizing in the etale topology of S here) and an etale morphism $\rho : X \to TX_e$ sending e to the zero section, such that*

$$X \times_G H = \rho^{-1}(TX_e \times_{TG_e} TH_e).$$

In particular, there is a vector sheaf V over S and a section $\sigma : X \to V$ such that $X \times_G H = \sigma^{-1}(0)$.

Proof: Let $X_1 \to G$ be a surjective vertical morphism with $X_1(S')$ connected for all artinian S' (with X_1 a scheme of finite type).

Put $Y_1 := X_1 \times_G H$. It is a subsheaf of X_1.

We can choose a vertical surjection $Z_1 \to Y_1$ (with Z_1 a scheme of finite type over S) together with a lift of (e, e) also denoted by e. Note that the morphism $Z_1 \to H$ is also vertical (using the composition property of vertical morphisms and the fact that the morphism $Y_1 \to H$ is vertical by the pullback property).

There is an etale neighborhood of $(e, e) \in X_1 \times_S X_1$ denoted by $U_1 \to X_1 \times_S X_1$ together with a lifting $\psi : U_1 \to X_1$ of the multiplication in G, such that ψ restricted to the inverse images of $\{e\} \times_S X_1$ or $X_1 \times_S \{e\}$ are the identity. We obtain a morphism

$$U_1 \times_{X_1 \times_S X_1} (Y_1 \times_S Y_1) \to Y_1$$

compatible with the multiplication in H and again having the property that the restrictions to the inverse images of the two "coordinate axes" are the identity. Now pull back our multiplication to

$$U_1 \times_{X_1 \times_S X_1} (Z_1 \times_S Z_1)$$

and note that $Z_1 \to Y_1$ being vertical, there is an etale neighborhood of the identity section (all of this is local on S!)

$$V_1 \to U_1 \times_{X_1 \times_S X_1} (Z_1 \times_S Z_1)$$

(which we can consider just as an etale neighborhood $V_1 \to Z_1 \times_S Z_1$) and a good lift of our multiplication

$$V_1 \to Z_1$$

restricting to the identity on the inverse images of the "coordinate axes". We obtain in this way morphisms on the etale germs

$$\mathbf{2}_{Z_1} : (Z_1, e) \to (Z_1, e)$$

and

$$\mathbf{2}_{X_1} : (X_1, e) \to (X_1, e)$$

compatible with the morphism $Z_1 \to X_1$. These morphisms induce multiplication by 2 on the tangent vector schemes. There are unique analytic isomorphisms of complex analytic germs

$$(X_1, e)^{\mathrm{an}} \cong (T(X_1)_e, 0)^{\mathrm{an}}$$

and

$$(Z_1, e)^{\mathrm{an}} \cong (T(Z_1)_e, 0)^{\mathrm{an}}$$

transforming the automorphisms **2** into multiplication by 2 and inducing the identity on tangent spaces at the identity section. (To see uniqueness, note that over artinian bases these are germs of vector spaces, and any germ of automorphism f of a vector space, such that $f(2x) = 2f(x)$, is linear; hence fixing it at the identity fixes it.)

By uniqueness, these isomorphisms are compatible with the morphism $Z_1 \to X_1$.

On the formal level, we have an etale morphism of formal germs

$$\hat{\varphi} : T(\widehat{X_1})_e \to X_1$$

such that $T(\widehat{Z_1})_e$ maps into Y_1. The *first claim* is that, in fact, this gives a map

$$Spec(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{T(X_1)_e, e(S)}) \to X_1$$

such that

$$T(Z_1)_e \times_{T(X_1)_e} Spec(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{T(X_1)_e, e(S)})$$

maps into Y_1. We can now apply Artin approximation to find an etale neighborhood $W_1 \to T(X_1)_e$ of the identity section (of course locally on S) together with a morphism $W_1 \to X_1$ inducing the identity on tangent vector schemes at the identity section, and sending

$$T(Z_1)_e \times_{T(X_1)_e} W_1 \to Y_1.$$

We can suppose that the morphism $W_1 \to X_1$ is etale. In particular the morphism $W_1 \to G$ is vertical. We obtain two subsheaves

$$im(T(Z_1)_e \times_{T(X_1)_e} W_1 \stackrel{pr_2}{\to} W_1) \subset W_1 \times_{X_1} Y_1 \subset W_1.$$

They have the same tangent subsheaves at the identity.

Our *main claim* is that by taking an open subset of W_1 (still a neighborhood of $e(P)$ for a given basepoint $P \in S$) we can assume that these two subsheaves are equal.

The first subsheaf is given by the vanishing of the morphism

$$W_1 \to T(X_1)_e / T(Z_1)_e = T(G)/T(H),$$

while the second subsheaf is equal to $W_1 \times_G H$. Setting $X = W_1$ we obtain the result of the theorem. We just have to prove the *first claim* and the *main claim*.

Proof of the first claim: By the sheaf condition and the finite type condition B1 and B2 for Y_1, it suffices to prove that for any artinian S', we have

$$T(Z_1)_e \times_{T(X_1)_e} Spec(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{T(X_1)_e, e(S)})(S')$$

mapping into $Y_1(S')$. That is to say, we have to prove that for any point $S' \to T(Z_1)_e$ mapping to a point of $T(X_1)_e$ located near the origin (that is to say factoring through $Spec(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{T(X_1)_e, e(S)})$), this point maps into $Y_1(S')$.

We change to an algebraic notation. We can suppose that $S = Spec(A)$, $T(X_1)_e = Spec(B)$ and $T(Z_1)_e = Spec(C)$. Further we can suppose that $S' = Spec(K)$ with K artinian (although not necessarily of finite type). We have $C \to K$. Since $T(Z_1)_e$ is a vector scheme we have a map $C \to C[t]$

corresponding to multiplication by t (and compatible with the same map on B). Let $\hat{B}$ denote the completion of B around the zero section (which corresponds to an ideal $\mathbf{b} \subset B$). We are provided with a factorisation $B \to \hat{B} \to K$.

We can assume that K is of finite type over $\hat{B}$, and in particular that K is the total fraction ring of a subring $R \subset K$ such that R is finite over $\hat{B}$. Let $\mathbf{r} \subset R$ denote the ideal corresponding to $\mathbf{b} \subset B$ (note that R is complete with respect to $\mathbf{r}$). Let $K\{t\} \subset K[[t]]$ denote the set of formal series of the form $\sum a_i t^i$ such that there exists $\eta \in R$ such that $\eta a_i \in \mathbf{r}^i$. With the same notations for B, multiplication by t provides a map $\hat{B} \to B\{t\}$ compatible with the map $B \to B[t]$, hence we get a map $\hat{B} \to K\{t\}$. On the other hand we get a map $C \to C[t] \to K[t] \to K\{t\}$. Putting these together we get a map

$$\hat{B} \otimes_B C \to K\{t\}$$

corresponding to multiplication by t. There is an evaluation at $t = 1$ which is a map $K\{t\} \to K$ (this summability of the formal series comes from the definition of $K\{t\}$ and the completeness of R), and the above map is compatible with this and with the map $\hat{B} \otimes_B C \to K$ given at the start. All in all we obtain a map

$$Spec(K\{t\}) \to T(Z_1)_e \times_{T(X_1)_e} Spec(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{T(X_1)_e, e(S)})$$

which induces on the subscheme $Spec(K) \to Spec(K\{t\})$ (evaluation at $t = 1$) the original inclusion. Now compose with the projection into G. We obtain a morphism

$$Spec(K\{t\}) \to G$$

which sends $Spec(K[[t]])$ into H (this comes from the condition that $\widehat{T(Z_1)}$ maps into Y_1 together with B1 and B2 for Y_1 or H) and we would like to show that it sends $Spec(K)$ (at $t = 1$) into H. It suffices to show that $Spec(K\{t\}) \to H$.

By Noether normalization there is a morphism $R' \to R$ such that R' is integral and R is finite over R'. Let K' be the total fraction ring of R': it is a field, and K is finite over K'. There is an ideal $\mathbf{r}' \subset R'$ which induces $\mathbf{r}$, and $K\{t\}$ is finite over the ring $K'\{t\}$ defined in the same way as above with respect to this ideal. Let G' and H' denote the direct images to $Spec(K')$ of the groups G and H pulled back to K. We have that H' is a presentable subgroup of the presentable group G' (Lemma 3.3), but since K' is a field, $H' \subset G'$ is a closed subgroup of the algebraic group G' over K'. Since K is finite over K' we have

$$K\{t\} = K'\{t\} \otimes_{K'} K,$$

whence our point $Spec(K\{t\}) \to G$ gives a point $Spec(K'\{t\}) \to G'$ sending $Spec(K'[[t]])$ into H'. Now since H' is a closed subgroup of G' both of which are algebraic groups (of finite type) over K', we get that $Spec(K'\{t\}) \to H'$, meaning that $Spec(K\{t\}) \to H$. This completes the proof of the first claim. □

Proof of the main claim: Suppose that the main claim is not true. Note that there is a scheme of finite type surjecting to $W_1 \times_{X_1} Y_1$. The falsity of the main claim means that the morphism from this scheme to $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$ is nonzero on any subset of the form pullback of an open subset of W_1 containing P. In particular we can find a (possibly nonreduced) curve inside this scheme, such that the section pulls back to something nonzero on the generic (artinian) point, but such that the image of the curve in W_1 contains P in its closure. We get an S-scheme S' with reduced scheme equal to a curve, and a morphism $\psi : S' \to W_1 \times_G H$ such that the projection into $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$ is nontrivial at the generic point of S', such that P is in the closure of the image of S'.

Let $\overline{S}'$ be a closure of S' relative to W_1 obtained by adding one point over P. Call this point P'. Then for any n there is an etale neighborhood of $P \in W_1$ on which the squaring map n-times is defined. We obtain an etale $\overline{S}'_n \to \overline{S}'$ on which the squaring map n-times is defined. We may assume that $\overline{S}'_n$ consists of an etale morphism $S'_n \to S'$, union one point P'_n over P'. Denote by $\psi_n : \overline{S}'_n \to W_1$ the result of the squaring operation iterated n times. There is an analytic isomorphism of a neighborhood of P'_n in $\overline{S}'_n$ with a neighborhood of P' in S', and an analytic trivialization of a neighborhood of P in W_1 (isomorphism with the tangent vector scheme) such that $\psi_n = 2^n\psi$ as analytic germs around the point P'_n.

Step 1. There is an n_0 such that for any $n \geq n_0$, the projection of S'_n into $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$ is nontrivial at the generic point of S'_n. In particular for any m the projection of S'_{mn_0} into $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$ is nontrivial at the generic point of S'_{mn_0}.

Let $v : W_1 \to T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$ denote our section. With respect to our analytic trivialization of W_1 where the squaring map becomes multiplication by 2, can take a Taylor expansion for v around the identity section of W_1,

$$v = v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + \ldots + v_{i-1} + w_i,$$

with $v_j(2x) = 2^j v(x)$ and w_i vanishes to order i along e; this notion can be defined by considering w_i as a section of a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ which contains $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$. By hypothesis the restriction of v to S' is nonzero at the generic point of S'. Let $\mathcal{G}_{S'}$ be the quotient of $\mathcal{F}|_{S'}$ by the "torsion" subsheaf (i.e. the subsheaf of sections supported in dimension zero). That a section is nonzero at the generic point means that its projection into $\mathcal{G}_{S'}$ is nonzero. We may choose i big enough so that v is nonzero in $\mathcal{G}_{S'}$ modulo the image of sections which vanish to order i along e. Let $\overline{v}_j$ denote the projection of v_j into the space of sections of $\mathcal{G}_{S'}$ modulo the image of the sections vanishing to order i. At least one of the $\overline{v}_j$ is nonzero. Now notice that the projection of $v(2^n x)$ is equal to

$$\overline{v(2^n x)} = 2^n \overline{v}_1(x) + 2^{2n}\overline{v}_2(x) + \ldots + 2^{(i-1)n}\overline{v}_{i-1}(x).$$

A little 2-adic argument shows that there is n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0$ this quantity must be nonzero. We obtain that $\overline{v(2^n x)} \neq 0$ and hence that $v(2^n x) = v(\psi_n x)$ is nonzero at the generic point of S'_n, as claimed for Step 1.

Step 2. The Zariski closure of the union of the images of the ψ_{mn_0} contains the zero-section. To prove this, note that in the formal completion at P, the union of the closures of the S'_{mn_0} is a subset stable under multiplication by 2^{n_0}, hence its Zariski closure is stable under (fiberwise) multiplication by 2, hence it is fiberwise homogeneous and thus contains the zero-section. The completion of the Zariski closure contains the Zariski closure of the intersection with the completion, so the zero-section is in the closure.

Step 3. Over the generic point of S, the zero section is in the Zariski closure of the S'_{mn_0}. Otherwise we would obtain a function nonvanishing on the zero section and vanishing on the S'_{mn_0}; clearing denominators this function can be assumed defined over S rather than the generic point of S, and since (we may assume) the S'_{mn_0} are all schemes of pure dimension 1 dominating S, this function defined over S which vanishes generically on the S'_{mn_0}, must vanish identically on the S'_{mn_0}. This would contradict the fact that the zero section is in the Zariski closure globally over S.

End of proof of claim: Now we work over the generic geometric artinian point of S. Change notations now to suppose that S is artinian and $S' = S$; we note the schemes S'_{mn_0} by S_{mn_0} (they are all isomorphic to S) with $S' =: S_1$. We have points $S_{mn_0} \to W_1 \times_G H$ all mapping to something nonzero in $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e$.

Note, as a bit of a detour, that the connected component of the identity in $W_1 \times_G H(S)$, must map to zero in $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e(S)$. This is because $T(X_1)_e/T(Z_1)_e(S) = T(X_1)_e(S)/T(Y_1)_e(S) = T(G)_e(S)/T(H)_e(S)$, whereas verticality of $X_1 \to G$ implies that $X_1(S) \to G(S)$ is smooth. In particular $W_1 \times_G H(S)$ is a smooth local complete intersection so a morphism from $W_1(S)$ to the normal space $T(G)_e(S)/T(H)_e(S)$ of $W_1 \times_G H(S)$, with zero set contained in the complete intersection, must have zero set which is a union of connected components of $W_1 \times_G H(S)$. Containing the identity, it contains the connected component of the identity.

In particular, our points $S_{mn_0} \to W_1 \times_G H$ from before are never in the connected component of $W_1 \times_G H(S)$ which contains the identity. On the other hand, these points all lift to $Z_2 \to W_1$ (a scheme of finite type surjecting vertically to $W_1 \times_G H$). Let $Z_2(S)'$ denote the union of components of $Z_2(S)$ which contain liftings of our points $S_{mn_0} \to W_1$. We have a morphism $Z_2(S)' \to W_1(Spec(k))$ whose image is a constructible set. But the image contains all of the points where the S_{mn_0} are located, so the image must contain a generic point of any irreducible component of the Zariski closure of the S_{mn_0}. In particular, there is a component of $Z_2(S)'$ which maps to something in $W_1(Spec(k))$ containing the identity in its closure.

Let $W_1(S)_e$ denote the inverse image of $e \in W_1(Spec(k))$ in $W_1(S)$. Let $N \subset G(S)$ denote the image of $W_1(S)_e \to G(S)$. We claim: that N is a unipotent subgroup of $G(S)$, and that the morphism $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is a fibration with connected fibers.

Assume this claim for the moment. The image of $W_1(S) \to W_1(Spec(k))$ is a closed subvariety $R \subset W_1(Spec(k))$ (this can be seen since W_1 is etale over the vector scheme TX_1). We have a morphism $R \to G(S)/N$. On the other hand, the above morphism $Z_1(S)' \to W_1(Spec(k))$ factors through a morphism $Z_1(S)' \to R$, and the image of this map contains $1 \in R$ in its closure.

The morphism $W_1(S) \to R$ is a fibration with fiber $W_1(S)_e$ in the etale topology. It suffices to prove that $TX_1(S) \to TX_1(Spec(k))$ is a fibration over its image, since locally in the etale topology W_1 is isomorphic to TX_1. In fact if V is any vector scheme then $V(S)$ and $V(Spec(k))$ are vector spaces so the morphism $V(S) \to V(Spec(k))$ is a fibration over its image, with fiber the inverse image of the origin.

We now show that the morphism

$$W_1 \times_G H(S) \to R \times_{G(S)/N} H(S)$$

is a fibration in the etale topology with fiber the kernel of $W_1(S)_e \to N$. Locally on R we can choose a lifting $\lambda : R \to W_1(S)$ and then we have a morphism

$$R \times_{G(S)/N} H(S) \to N$$

given by $(r, h) \mapsto h^{-1} im(\lambda(r))$. We claim that (locally over R)

$$W_1(S) \times_{G(S)} H(S) = W_1(S)_e \times_N (R \times_{G(S)/N} H(S)).$$

The morphism from right to left associates to the point (a, r, h) the point $(i(a) * \lambda(r), h)$ where $i : W_1 \to W_1$ is an etale-locally defined morphism covering the inverse. This shows that the morphism at the start of the paragraph is a fibration.

Suppose A is an algebraic group with connected algebraic subgroups $B \subset A$ and $N \subset A$. Then the morphism

$$B/(B \cap N) \to A/N$$

is proper over an open neighborhood of the class of the identity in A/N. To prove this, proceed as follows. Let $I \subset A/N$ denote the image. Let $Z \subset A/N$ denote the subset of points over which the

map in question is not proper. This can be constructed as follows. Let $X := B/(B \cap N)$, and let $\overline{X}$ be a relative completion with proper morphism $\overline{X} \to A/N$; and suppose that $X \subset \overline{X}$ is open and dense. Then Z is the image of $\overline{X} - X$. Since the map $X \to A/N$ is injective, we have that the dimension of the image Z is strictly less than the dimension of the image I of X. In particular, there is a point $y \in I$ such that the morphism in question is proper over a neighborhood U of y. But since B acts on X and compatibly on A (by left multiplication) the morphism in question is proper over any translate of the form bU. Setting $b \in B$ equal to the inverse of a representative in for y we obtain a neighborhood bU of the identity over which the map is proper.

Note that by the above claim that we are accepting for now, the fiber of the fibration $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is connected. On the other hand, by the previous paragraph the map $H(S) \to G(S)/N$ induces a map $H(S)/(H(S) \cap N) \to G(S)/N$ which is proper over a neighborhood of the class of the identity. Let $I \subset G(S)/N$ be the image of this map. It is a locally closed subset and the subset topology coincides with the topology of the base of the fibration, at least near the identity. Note that $H(S)$ is fibered over I with fibers $H(S) \cap N$ which are connected because N and hence $H(S) \cap N$ are unipotent groups (unipotent groups are always connected). Finally we have the following situation:

$$W_1 \times_G H(S) \to R \times_{G(S)/N} I$$

is a fibration with connected fiber, whereas $I \subset G(S)/N$ is a locally closed subset. Since an etale fibration is an open map, the image of the connected component of the identity in $W_1 \times_G H(S)$ is an open neighborhood of the identity in $R \times_{G(S)/N} I$. Since the fibers of the fibration are connected, the image of the complement of the identity component is the complement of the image of the identity component. In particular, there is an open neighborhood of the identity in $R \times_{G(S)/N} I \subset R$ (and hence an open neighborhood of the identity in R) whose inverse image doesn't meet any other connected component of $W_1 \times_G H(S)$. Finally, since R is a closed subset of $W_1(Spec(k))$, we obtain an open neighborhood of the identity in $W_1(Spec(k))$ whose inverse image in $W_1 \times_G H(S)$ is contained in the connected component of the identity. This is a contradiction to our earlier situation where $Z_2(S)' \to W_1(Spec(k))$ has image a constructible set with the identity in its closure. This completes the proof modulo the following part.

We have to show that N is a unipotent subgroup of $G(S)$ and that the morphism $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is a fibration with connected fibers.

Write $S = Spec(A)$ with A artinian, and choose a sequence of ideals $I_j \subset A$ for example $I_j = \mathbf{m}^j$. Let

$$W_1(S)_j$$

be the set of points of $W_1(S)$ which restrict to the identity on $Spec(A/I_j)$. In particular $W_1(S)_1 = W_1(S)_e$. Choose a good lift of the multiplication

$$W_1 \times W_1 \to W_1$$

in a formal neighborhood of our point P. We obtain

$$* : W_1(S)_e \times W_1(S)_e \to W_1(S)_e.$$

This operation is not a group, however we have the following property.

$$* : W_1(S)_j \times W_1(S)_j \to W_1(S)_j.$$

Next, note that the fact that W_1 is etale over a vector scheme gives another operation which we denote

$$+ : W_1(S)_e \times W_1(S)_e \to W_1(S)_e$$

which is an abelian group structure. We can write

$$a * b = a + b + F(a, b)$$

where

$$F : W_1(S)_j \times W_1(S)_j \to W_1(S)_{j+1}.$$

This is because there is a unique good operation on the set of elements of $W_1(Spec(A/I_{j+1})$ which restrict to the identity in $W_1(Spec(A/I_j)$. (Also note that the $+$-quotient $W_1(S)_j/W_1(S)_{j+1}$ injects into this subset of $W_1(Spec(A/I_{j+1}))$.

Because of this formula, we can define the quotient $W_1(S)_j/W_1(S)_{j+1}$ with respect to the operation $*$ and it is the same as the quotient with respect to $+$. In particular note that the morphism

$$W_1(S)_j \to W_1(S)_j/W_1(S)_{j+1}$$

is a fibration with fiber a vector space.

The morphism $W_1(S)_e \to G(S)$ is compatible with the operation $*$. Let N_j denote the image of $W_1(S)_j$ in $G(S)$ (in particular $N_1 = N$). The N_j are constructible sets and subgroups so they are algebraic subgroups of $G(S)$. We obtain a surjective morphism

$$W_1(S)_j/W_1(S)_{j+1} \to N_j/N_{j+1},$$

but from the previous formula the operation on the left is a unipotent algebraic group, this shows that N_j/N_{j+1} is a unipotent group, and since extensions of unipotent groups are unipotent (and $N_j = \{1\}$ for j large), $N = N_1$ is unipotent.

We claim that $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is smooth. Suppose $R' \subset R$ is an inclusion of artinian schemes over $Spec(k)$. Look at the map

$$W_1(S)_e(R) \to W_1(S)_e(R') \times_{N(R')} N(R).$$

Suppose that we have a map $S \times R \to G$ and a lifting over $S \times R'$ to W_1, sending $Spec(k) \times R$ to e. We would like to find a lifting over $S \times R$ sending $Spec(k) \times R$ to e. We can do this whenever R' is a union of R_i and we have commuting retracts from R' to R_i, just apply the verticality property to $R \times S$ with retracts to $R_i \times S$ and $R \times Spec(k)$. This proves that the morphism $W_1(S)_e \to G(S)$ is vertical with respect to $Spec(k)$. It is then immediate that the morphism $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is surjective (since N is the image of the previous map). Note that N is presentable, so by Lemma 6.2, the morphism $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is smooth.

Let $K \subset W_1(S)_e$ be the inverse image of $1 \in N$. Then for any two points a, b with $f(a) = f(b)$ there is a unique element $k \in K$ such that $b = k * a$ (the existence and uniqueness of such an element $k \in W_1(S)_e$ can be seen using the above grading and the expression for $*$, and then it is immediate that $k \in K$ from compatibility of f with $*$). Any point $n \in N$ has an etale neighborhood $n \in U \xrightarrow{p} N$ with a section $\sigma : U \to W_1(S)_e$. Then we obtain a morphism

$$K \times U \to W_1(S)_e \times_N U$$

obtained by sending (k,u) to $(k*\sigma(u),p(u))$. This is an isomorphism on the level of points by the above property for K, and both sides are smooth, so it is an isomorphism. This proves that $W_1(S)_e \to N$ is a fibration in the etale topology.

Finally, to show that the fibers are connected it suffices to show that K is connected. But since $W_1(S)_e$ and N are vector spaces and the morphism f is a fibration in the etale topology, the associated analytic morphism is a fibration in the usual topology, so the fiber is contractible. □

9. The Lie algebra sheaf

Theorem 9.1 *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a presentable group sheaf, and if we set $Lie(\mathcal{G}) := T(\mathcal{G})_1$, then there is a unique bilinear form (Lie bracket)*

$$[\cdot,\cdot] : Lie(\mathcal{G}) \times Lie(\mathcal{G}) \to Lie(\mathcal{G})$$

which, over artinian base schemes, reduces to the usual Lie bracket.

Proof: A section of $Lie(\mathcal{G})$ over $S' = Spec(A)$ is a morphism $Spec(A[\epsilon]) \to \mathcal{G}$ sending $Spec(A)$ to the identity section (in our notation here ϵ denotes an element with $\epsilon^2 = 0$). Given two such morphisms which we denote α and β we obtain

$$\alpha p_1,\ \beta p_2 : Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']) \to \mathcal{G}$$

(where also $(\epsilon')^2 = 0$) and we can form the morphism

$$\gamma := \alpha p_1 \cdot \beta p_2 \cdot (\alpha m p_1) \cdot (\beta m p_2) : Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']) \to \mathcal{G}$$

where the $g \cdot h$ denotes composition in $\mathcal{G}$, and where $m = A[\epsilon] \to A[\epsilon]$ is the involution sending ϵ to $-\epsilon$. The morphism γ restricts to the identity on $Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']/(\epsilon\epsilon'))$. Let

$$q : Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']) \to Spec(A[\delta])$$

denote the morphism sending δ to $\epsilon\epsilon'$ (here again $\delta^2 = 0$).

Our first claim is that if the morphism γ factors as $\gamma = \varphi \circ q$ then φ is unique. To see this suppose that ϕ and φ were two morphisms $Spec(A[\delta]) \to \mathcal{G}$ with $\phi \circ q = \varphi \circ q$. Let $X \to \mathcal{G}$ and $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ be the morphisms in a presentation of $\mathcal{G}$, with a chosen lift of the identity section into X. Choose liftings $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\tilde{\phi}$ from $Spec(A[\delta])$ into X sending $Spec(A)$ to the identity section of X (here we may have to localize on $S' = Spec(A)$ in the etale topology—but henceforth ignore this point, much as we have already ignored it in lifting the identity section into $X\dots$). The fact that the compositions with q are the same means that the pair $(\tilde{\varphi} \circ q, \tilde{\phi} \circ q)$ defines a point which we denote

$$\eta : Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']) \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X.$$

Note that $Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']/(\epsilon\epsilon'))$ projects by q to $Spec(A) \subset Spec(A[\delta])$ and both $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\tilde{\phi}$ send $Spec(A)$ to the identity section (by hypothesis on our liftings) so in particular η sends $Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon']/(\epsilon\epsilon'))$ to the identity pair (e,e) in $X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$. On the other hand we can take $Y = Spec(A[\epsilon,\epsilon'])$ and $Y_1 = Spec(A[\epsilon])$ and $Y_2 = Spec(A[\epsilon'])$ and then apply the lifting property $Lift_2(Y,Y_i)$ which holds for the morphism $R \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ because (from the hypothesis in the property $P4$) this morphism is vertical.

Fix a lifting $e_R : S \to R$ of the identity pair in $X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ and fix the values of the morphisms (denoted λ_i in the definition of the lifting property) as being e_R on Y_1 and Y_2. These are indeed

liftings of our given morphisms $Y_i \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ since, as we have seen above, both Y_1 and Y_2 map to the identity pair (the subscheme defined by $(\epsilon\epsilon')$ is the union of Y_1 and Y_2). We obtain by the lifting property a lifting $Y \to R$ which agrees with e_R on Y_1 and Y_2. If we write (locally) $R = Spec(B)$ then this morphism corresponds to a morphism $a : B \to A[\epsilon, \epsilon']$ such that the projection of B modulo ϵ or modulo ϵ' is a constant morphism $B \to A$. It now follows that a factors through $B \to A[\delta]$. We obtain a morphism $Spec(A[\delta]) \to R$ whose projection into $X \times X$ is the pair $(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\phi})$ (that this is the case is easy to check directly again by supposing that X is affine). This implies that $(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\phi})$ has image in $X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$, in other words that the morphisms $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\tilde{\phi}$ from $Spec(A[\delta])$ into X project to the same morphism into $\mathcal{G}$. Thus $\varphi = \phi$, completing the proof of uniqueness.

Now we show existence of the factorization $\gamma = \varphi \circ q$. The preceding uniqueness result implies that it is sufficient to construct φ after etale localization on S'. Thus we may assume that α and β lift to points $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta} : Spec(A[\epsilon]) \to X$ sending $Spec(A)$ to the identity section. There is a good lifting of the multiplication in $\mathcal{G}$ to a multiplication $X \times X \to X$ which we still denote $x \cdot y$, where goodness means the property $x \cdot e = e \cdot x = x$. We can now put

$$\tilde{\gamma} := \tilde{\alpha} p_1 \cdot \tilde{\beta} p_2 \cdot (\tilde{\alpha} m p_1) \cdot (\tilde{\beta} m p_2) : Spec(A[\epsilon, \epsilon']) \to X.$$

We still have the formula that

$$\alpha \cdot (\alpha m) = e$$

(this is because the first order term of the composition is just addition of vectors) and from this formula it follows that $\tilde{\gamma}$ sends the subschemes $Spec(A[\epsilon])$ and $Spec(A[\epsilon'])$ to e (through their projections to $Spec(A)$). Since now X is a scheme, this implies directly the existence of $\tilde{\varphi} : Spec(A[\delta]) \to X$ such that $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\varphi} \circ q$. Projecting from X to $\mathcal{G}$ we get the factorization φ desired.

Finally, we set $[\alpha, \beta] := \varphi$ from the above construction. It is of course completely clear from the construction that if S' is artinian, this gives the usual Lie bracket on the algebraic group $\mathcal{G}(S')$. it remains to be seen that this morphism is bilinear and satisfies the Jacobi identity (i.e. that a certain deduced trilinear form vanishes). But these properties can be checked on values over artinian schemes S', and there since the bracket we have defined coincides with the usual one, we get bilinearity and the Jacobi identity. □

Remark: The subtlety in our whole situation being essentially that the factorization, while immediate and obviously unique in the case where the target of the map is a scheme, does not necessarily exist and may not be unique even if it does exist, when the target of the map is just a sheaf. One can give examples of $P2$ sheaves $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathcal{X}/S$ together with morphisms $Spec(A[\epsilon, \epsilon']) \to \mathcal{H}$ restricting to a given section $S \to \mathcal{H}$ over the subscheme defined by $(\epsilon\epsilon')$, and where the morphism either doesn't factor through $Spec(A[\delta])$ or else such that the factorization isn't unique.

We indicate here a simpler example which shows the way toward the examples refered to in the above paragraph. Let $Y \to X$ be a degree 2 morphism of smooth curves completely ramified above a point $x \in X$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the image of this morphism (considered as a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$). Let y be the point lying over x and suppose $f : Spec(k[\epsilon]/\epsilon^3) \to Y$ is a nonzero tangent vector located at y. Then the associated element of $\mathcal{F}(Spec(k[\tau]/\tau^3))$ is constant (equal to the constant point y) on the subscheme

$$Spec(k[\tau]/\tau^2) \subset Spec(k[\tau]/\tau^3).$$

Nevertheless there exists no factorization of the form

$$Spec(k[\tau]/\tau^3) \subset Spec(k[\tau]/\tau^2) \to \mathcal{F}$$

(this factorization would have existed had $\mathcal{F}$ been a scheme).

We can obtain an example where a factorization of the type needed in the above theorem doesn't exist, simply by composing this example with the morphism $Spec(k[\epsilon,\epsilon']) \to Spec(k[\tau]/\tau^3$ sending τ to $\epsilon+\epsilon'$.

The sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ in this example is not $P4$ with respect to $Spec(k)$. Of course $\mathcal{F}$ is not a group sheaf. As stated elsewhere, I am not sure about whether a $P2$ group sheaf might not automatically have to be $P4$ for example (or at least satisfy some of the properties we use here). For example we have seen that an algebraic space (of finite type) which is a group is automatically a scheme.

The adjoint representation

Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a presentable group sheaf. Then $\mathcal{G}$ acts on itself by conjugation, by the formula

$$Int(g)(h) := ghg^{-1}.$$

More precisely this action is a morphism $\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{G}$ and if we put in the identity map on the first projection we obtain a morphism $\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{G}\to\mathcal{G}\times\mathcal{G}$ which is a morphism of group objects (the second variable) over the first variable $\mathcal{G}$. From this and from the invariance of the above definition of the Lie algebra object, this action induces an action (the *adjoint action*)

$$\mathcal{G}\times Lie(\mathcal{G})\to Lie(\mathcal{G})$$

which preserves the bracket.

If $(\mathcal{L},[,])$ is a Lie algebra sheaf (that is to say, $\mathcal{L}$ is a vector sheaf with bilinear morphism $[,]:\mathcal{L}\times\mathcal{L}\to\mathcal{L}$ satisfying the Jacobi identity) then we obtain a group sheaf $Aut(\mathcal{L},[,])$.

Lemma 9.2 *If $(\mathcal{L},[,])$ is a Lie algebra sheaf then $Aut(\mathcal{L},[,])$ is a presentable group sheaf.*

Proof: The group sheaf $Aut(\mathcal{L})$ of automorphisms of the vector sheaf $\mathcal{L}$ is presentable and in particular $P4$ by Theorem 4.24. The Lie bracket can be considered as a morphism

$$\mathcal{L}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{L}\to\mathcal{L}.$$

The subgroup $Aut(\mathcal{L},[,])\subset Aut(\mathcal{L})$ may thus be represented as the equalizer of two morphisms

$$Aut(\mathcal{L})\to Hom(\mathcal{L}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{L},\mathcal{L}).$$

Note that $Hom(\mathcal{L}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{L},\mathcal{L})$ is a vector sheaf by Lemma 4.19 and the definition of tensor product following that lemma; and presentable by Theorem 4.24. In particular $Aut(\mathcal{L},[,])$ is $P4$ by Lemma 1.6 and presentable by Corollary 1.12. □

The adjoint action may be interpreted as a morphism of presentable group sheaves

$$Ad:\mathcal{G}\to Aut(Lie(\mathcal{G}),[,]).$$

We can of course forget about the bracket and compose this with the morphism into $Aut(Lie(\mathcal{G}))$ which is just the automorphism sheaf of a vector sheaf.

Proposition 9.3 *Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected presentable group sheaf. Then the kernel of the morphism Ad is the center $Z(\mathcal{G})$ (that is to say the sheaf whose values are the centers of the values of $\mathcal{G}$).*

Proof: The statement amounts to saying that a section g of $\mathcal{G}$ acts trivially on $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if it acts trivially on $Lie(\mathcal{G})$. This statement is true, in fact, of any automorphism (defined over any base scheme $S' \to S$). It suffices to prove this last statement for the values over artinian base schemes (if an automorphism agrees with the identity on the values over all artinian base schemes then it must be equal to the identity). In the case of values over artinian base schemes it is just the statement that an automorphism which acts trivially on the Lie algebra of a connected algebraic group must act trivially on the whole group. □

Corollary 9.4 *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected presentable group sheaf, then the center $Z(\mathcal{G})$ is again presentable.*

Proof: By Proposition 9.3 the center is the kernel of a morphism of presentable group sheaves. By Theorem 1.13, this kernel is presentable. □

Question Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a presentable group sheaf, not necessarily connected. Is the center $Z(\mathcal{G})$ presentable?

This is related to the following question.

Question Suppose H is a finite presentable group sheaf. Is $Aut(H)$ presentable?

A positive response here would allow us to prove that the center $Z(\mathcal{G})$ is connected, because it is the kernel of the action of $Z(\mathcal{G}^o)$ on the group of connected components $H = \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^o$.

Determination of presentable group sheaves by their Lie algebras

The object of this section is to prove the following theorem, which is a generalization of the well known principle that a Lie group is determined by its Lie algebra, up to finite coverings, if the center is unipotent.

Lemma 9.5 *Suppose $F, G \subset H$ are two presentable group subsheaves of a presentable group sheaf H, and suppose F and G are connected. If $Lie(F) = Lie(G)$ as subsheaves of $Lie(H)$ then $F = G$.*

Proof: By the properties B1 and B2 and artin approximation, it suffices to show that for any artinian S' we have $F(S') = G(S')$. But these two are connected Lie subgroups of $H(S')$ which by hypothesis have the same Lie algebras; thus they are equal. □

Corollary 9.6 *Suppose F and G are connected presentable group sheaves on $\mathcal{X}$. Suppose $Lie(F) \to Lie(G)$ is an isomorphism of Lie algebras. Then this isomorphism lifts to a unique isomorphism $F/Z(F) \cong G/Z(G)$ where $Z()$ denotes the center.*

Proof: Note that the center of a connected presentable group sheaf is presentable by 9.4, so $F/Z(F)$ and $G/Z(G)$ are presentable.

Let $L = Lie(F) = Lie(G)$ and let $A = Aut(L)$ (automorphisms of the vector sheaf or of the Lie algebra sheaf, we don't care). We get maps $F \to A$ and $G \to A$. Let F_1 and G_1 denote the images. We have

$$Lie(F_1) = im(L \to Lie(A)) = Lie(G_1)$$

as subsheaves of $Lie(A)$, so by Lemma 9.5 we have $F_1 = G_1$. On the other hand, note that $Z(F)$ is the kernel of the map $F \to A$ because if an element of F acts trivially on $Lie(F)$ then by exponentiation and the fact that F is connected, it acts trivially on all $F(S')$ for S' artinian hence in fact it acts trivially on F. Thus $F_1 = F/Z(F)$ and similarly $G_1 = G/Z(G)$. □

We have now finished verifying that the class of presentable group sheaves satisfies the properties set out in the introduction. In effect:
Property 1 is Corollary 2.6;
Property 2 is Theorem 1.13;
Property 3 is Lemma 3.2;
Property 4 is Lemma 3.3;
Property 5 is Theorem 6.4;
Property 6 is Theorem 7.2 and Corollary 7.3;
Property 7 is Theorem 9.1; and
Property 8 is Theorem 9.6.

Questions

We present in further detail some other questions analogous to well known properties of algebraic Lie groups, which seem to be more difficult here.

1. (Existence) *If* $(\mathcal{L}, [,])$ *is a Lie algebra sheaf (i.e. a vector sheaf with bilinear operation satisfying the Jacobi identity) then does there exist a presentable group sheaf* $\mathcal{G}$ *with* $Lie(\mathcal{G}) = (\mathcal{L}, [,])$*?* One has the following idea for a proof of existence in a formal sense. Take a resolution of $\mathcal{L}$ by vector schemes, and lift the bracket to a bracket (not necessarily satisfying the Jacobi identity) on the vector scheme X surjecting to $\mathcal{L}$. Then use an explicit version of Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff to define a composition law on the formal completion of X along the zero section. This composition law will not be associative, but one should be able to use the second part of the resolution of $\mathcal{L}$ to define a relation scheme R (formally), such that when we set $\mathcal{G}$ to be the quotient of X by R we get a group sheaf. One would have to check that the maps are vertical. Of course this idea for a proof skirts the main question of how to integrate the formal structure out into an actual presentable group sheaf.

2. *Does every (connected, say) presentable group sheaf have a faithful representation on a vector sheaf?* I guess that the answer is probably no, but I don't have a specific example in mind.

3. *Suppose* $Lie(\mathcal{F}) \to Lie(\mathcal{G})$ *is a morphism of vector Lie algebras. Under what conditions does this lift to a morphism* $\mathcal{F}' \to \mathcal{G}$ *where* $\mathcal{F}' \to \mathcal{F}$ *is a finite covering?*

4. *What happens in Theorem 9.6 if we don't divide out by the centers?*

5. *Suppose* $G \subset Aut(V)$ *is a presentable subgroup of the automorphisms of a vector sheaf. Is there a vector subsheaf* $U \subset T^{a,b}(V)$ *of a tensor power of* V *(or possibly a cotensor power or a mixture...) such that* U *is preserved by the action of* G *and such that* G *is characterized as the subgroup of* $Aut(V)$ *preserving* U*?* One of the main problems in trying to prove such a statement is that the vector sheaves (and similarly $P4$ or $P5$ sheaves) don't satisfy any nice chain condition.

Note that in the situation of question 4, for any sub-vector sheaf U of a tensor and cotensor combination of V, the subgroup of $Aut(V)$ of elements preserving U is a presentable subgroup, so at least we obtain a way of constructing examples, even if we don't know whether we get everything this way.

10. Presentable n-stacks

Recall that an n-groupoid in the sense of [Ta] is essentially the same thing as an n-truncated homotopy type [Ta2]. In view of this, we can approach the theory of n-stacks (we assume from here on that this means n-stack of n-groupoids and drop the word "groupoid" from the notation) via the theory of presheaves of topological spaces or equivalently simplicial presheaves[Ja]. We adopt a working

convention that by *n-stack* we mean the presheaf of n-groupoids associated to a fibrant presheaf of spaces [Ja] [Si] or, a bit more generally, any presheaf of n-groupoids such that the associated simplicial presheaf (taking the diagonal of the nerve) is fibrant in the sense of [Si] which means that it satisfies the global part of the fibrant condition of Jardine [Ja].

Some special cases are worth mentioning. A 0-stack is simply a sheaf of sets. A 1-stack is what is usually called a stack—it is a sort of sheaf of groupoids. The notions of 2-stack and 3-stack were explored heuristically from the category-theoretic point of view in [Br2].

We suppose given an adequate theory of morphism n-stacks $Hom(R,T)$; and of homotopy fiber products $T \times_R T'$ for n-stacks. These can be had, for example, within the realm of presheaves of spaces [Ja] [Si] [Si2].

The path-stack $P^{t_1,t_2}T$ on $\mathcal{X}/S$ between two basepoints (i.e. objects) $t_1, t_2 \in T(S)$ is then well defined. We denote by $\pi_0(T)$ the truncation down to a sheaf of sets, and from this and the path space construction we obtain the homotopy group sheaves $\pi_i(T,t)$ over $\mathcal{X}/S$ for an n-stack T and object $t \in T(S)$.

In terms of the easier-to-understand version version of the theory involving presheaves of spaces, the homotopy group sheaves are defined as follows. If $t \in T(S)$ then for any $Y \to S$ we get a basepoint $t|_Y \in T(Y)$. The functor

$$Y/S \mapsto \pi_i(T(Y), t|_Y)$$

is a presheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ which we denote by $\pi_i^{\mathrm{pre}}(T,t)$. Then $\pi_i(T,t)$ is sheaf associated to this presheaf.

There is probably a good extension of the theory to ∞-stacks which would correspond to presheaves of spaces which are not necessarily truncated (and I suppose that it again becomes equivalent to Jardine's theory but there may be a few subtleties hidden here). Generally below when we speak of n-stacks, n will be indeterminate. There is probably not too much difference between the theory of ∞-stacks and the projective limit of the theories of n-stacks, so we will stick to the notation n-stack.

For $t_1, t_2 \in T(S)$ use the notation $\varpi_1(T, t_1, t_2)$ for the sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ of paths in $T|_{\mathcal{X}/S}$ from t_1 to t_2 up to homotopy. Thus

$$\varpi_1(T, t_1, t_2) = \pi_0(P^{t_1,t_2}T).$$

We make the following definition.

—We say that an n-stack T on $\mathcal{X}$ is *presentable* if it satisfies the following conditions:

1. The sheaf $\pi_0(T)$ is P1 over k.
2. For any finite type morphism of schemes $Z \to Y$ and any two sections $\eta : Y \to T$ and $\eta' : Z \to T$ the sheaf $\varpi_1(T|_{\mathcal{Z}/Z}, \eta|_Z, \eta')$, when restricted down from Z to Y, is $P4$ over Y.
3. For any scheme Y and section $\eta : Y \to T$, the higher homotopy group sheaves $\pi_i((T|_{\mathcal{Z}/Y}), \eta)$, for $i \geq 1$, are presentable group sheaves ($P5$) over Y.

(Recall that if $\mathcal{H}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/Z$ then it can also be considered as a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$ with a map to Z; the restriction down to Y is the same sheaf taken with the composed map to Y, then considered as a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/Y$. This shouldn't be confused with the direct image from Z to Y. In heuristic topological terms the fiber over $y \in Y$ of the restriction is obtained by taking the direct union of the fibers of $\mathcal{H}$ over the points z lying over y, whereas the fiber of the direct image is obtained by taking the direct product of the fibers of $\mathcal{H}$ over points z lying over y.)

Caution: This definition of presentability is very slightly different from the definition given in [Si]. The older version of presentability for T as defined in [Si] corresponds to the property $P3$ for

π_0 (see Theorem 10.3 below); whereas the present definition corresponds to the property $P3\frac{1}{2}$ (see Theorem 10.1 below). I hope that the present version corresponding to $P3\frac{1}{2}$ will be the most useful. The reason for changing the definition was to be able to state Theorem 10.5 in a nice way, i.e. to have a reasonable definition of *presentable morphism* of n-stacks.

Caution: If T is 0-truncated, that is a sheaf of sets, and happens to have a group structure, then this notion is not the same as the notion that T be a presentable group sheaf. The presentability in T as defined here refers to the higher homotopy groups. In fact, presentability in this case corresponds to the property $P3\frac{1}{2}$ rather than $P4$ (see below).

We can also reasonably use the notations *presentable homotopy sheaf*; *presentable space over* $\mathcal{X}$ or just *presentable space*; or *presentable fibrant presheaf of spaces*, for the notion of presentable n-stack.

Property 1 implies the seemingly stronger statement that there is a section $f : Z \to T$ over a scheme Z of finite type over k, such that the associated morphism $Z \to \pi_0(T)$ is surjective.

The second condition reduces, in the case $\eta = \eta'$, to the statement that for any scheme Y and section $\eta : Y \to T$, the fundamental group sheaf $\pi_1((T|_{\mathcal{Z}/Y}), \eta)$ is a presentable group sheaf over Y.

We can give an alternative characterization, from which it follows that any truncation $\tau_{\leq n}T$ of a presentable space is again presentable. Recall that we have defined a condition $P3\frac{1}{2}$ which is intermediate between $P2$ and $P4$.

Theorem 10.1 *Suppose T is an n-stack over X. Then T is presentable if and only if the sheaf π_0 is $P3\frac{1}{2}$, and for any $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in T(Y)$, the sheaves $\pi_i(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, t)$ are presentable group sheaves ($P5$) over Y.*

Proof: Suppose T is presentable. Then we just have to show that π_0 is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. We know that it is P1, so there is a surjection $Y \to \pi_0$. By replacing Y by an etale cover, we may assume that this comes from a point $t \in T(Y)$. The path space $P^{p_1^*t, p_2^*t}T$ maps to $Y \times Y$, and

$$\varpi_1(T, p_1^*t, p_2^*t) = \pi_0(P^{p_1^*t, p_2^*t}T) \to Y \times_{\pi_0} Y$$

is surjective. Let $G \to Y$ be the sheaf of groups $\pi_1(T|_Y, t)$. It is presentable by hypothesis, and G acts freely on (the restriction from $Y \times Y$ down to Y of) $\varpi_1(T, p_1^*t, p_2^*t)$ with quotient $Y \times_{\pi_0} Y$. Finally, we know that (the restriction from $Y \times Y$ down to Y of) $\varpi_1(T, p_1^*t, p_2^*t)$ is $P4$ over Y; thus the quotient $Y \times_{\pi_0} Y$ is $P4$ over Y by Theorem 1.10. Now by definition there exists a surjective morphism $Q \to Y \times_{\pi_0} Y$ which is Y-vertical. This is what is required to show that π_0 is $P3\frac{1}{2}$.

Now suppose that π_0 is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ and that the other homotopy group sheaves are presentable. We obtain immediately that π_0 is P1. Let $X \to \pi_0$ be the surjection given by the property $P3\frac{1}{2}$. Then we have an X-vertical surjection $Q \to X \times_{\pi_0} X$ (where the morphism to X is the first projection). Suppose $X' \to X$ is an etale surjection chosen so that the map $X \to \pi_0$ lifts to $t \in T(X')$. Let Q' be the pullback of $X' \times X'$ to Q. Then $Q' = (X' \times_{\pi_0} X') \times_{X \times_{\pi_0} X} Q$ so $Q' \to X' \times_{\pi_0} X'$ is X-vertical, and hence X'-vertical. This implies that $X' \times_{\pi_0} X'$ is $P4$ over X', because we can take as the relation scheme

$$Q' \times_{X' \times_{\pi_0} X'} Q' = Q' \times_{X' \times X'} Q'$$

which is already a scheme of finite type (and the identity is vertical). Now we have a sheaf of groups $G = \pi_1(T|_{X'}, t)$ over X' which is by hypothesis presentable, and G acts freely on $\varpi_1(T, p_1^*t, p_2^*t)$ with quotient $X' \times_{\pi_0} X'$. By Theorem 1.10, $\varpi_1(T, p_1^*t, p_2^*t)$ is $P4$ over X'.

Now suppose that we have a finite type morphism $q : Z \to Y$ and two points $\eta_1 \in T(Y)$ and $\eta_2 \in T(Z)$, and we show that the restriction from Z to Y of the path space $\varpi_1(T, \eta_1|_Z, \eta_2)$ is $P4$

over Y. There are etale surjections $Y' \to Y$ and $Z' \to Z$ (of finite type) with $Z' \to Y'$ and there are morphisms $f_1 : Y' \to X'$ and $f_2 : Z' \to X'$ such that $f_1^*(t)$ is homotopic to $\eta_1|_{Y'}$ and $f_2^*(t)$ is homotopic to $\eta_2|_{Z'}$. Let $(f_1|_{Z'}, f_2) : Z' \to X' \times X'$ denote the resulting morphism (the first projection of which factors through Y'). Then

$$\varpi_1(T, \eta_1|_Z, \eta_2)|_{Z'} = \varpi_1(T, \eta_1|_{Z'}, \eta_2|_{Z'}) = (f_1|_{Z'}, f_2)^* \varpi_1(T, p_1^* t, p_2^* t)$$

$$= (q, f_2)^* [\varpi_1(T, p_1^* t, p_2^* t)|_{Y' \times X'}].$$

Note that $\varpi_1(T, p_1^* t, p_2^* t)|_{Y' \times X'}$ is $P4$ with respect to Y', so by the appendix to the proof below, one gets that the restriction down to Y' of $\varpi_1(T, \eta_1|_Z, \eta_2)|_{Z'}$ is $P4$ with respect to Y'. By Corollary 2.5, the restriction down to Y of $\varpi_1(T, \eta_1|_Z, \eta_2)$ is $P4$ over Y. □

Appendix to the proof: Suppose $Z \to Y$ is a finite type morphism, and suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on Y. Then the restriction from Z down to Y of the pullback $\mathcal{F}|_Z$ is equal to the fiber product $Z \times_Y \mathcal{F}$. Note also that Z is $P4$ over Y. Thus if $\mathcal{F}$ is $P4$ over Y then the restriction of the pullback is again $P4$.

Corollary 10.2 *If T is a presentable n-stack and if $m < n$ then $\tau_{\leq m} T$ is a presentable m-stack.*

Proof: Indeed the truncation operation preserves the homotopy group sheaves (and the homotopy sheaf π_0). By the theorem, presentability is expressed solely in terms of these sheaves so it is preserved by truncation. □

We have a similar theorem for the old version of presentability of T [Si].

Theorem 10.3 *Suppose T is an n-stack over X. Then T is presentable in the sense of [Si] if and only if the sheaf π_0 is $P3$, and for any $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in T(Y)$, the sheaves $\pi_i(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, t)$ are presentable group sheaves ($P5$) over Y.*

Proof: The proof is the same as above only very slightly easier. The details are left to the reader. □

Very presentable n-stacks

We make the following more restrictive definition. Say that a presentable group sheaf G on $\mathcal{X}/S$ is *affine* if, for any artinian S-scheme S', the group scheme $G(S')$ over $Spec(k)$ is affine. A truncated homotopy sheaf T is *very presentable* if T is presentable and if for any $\eta \in T_Y$ we have that $\pi_1(T/Y, \eta)$ is affine, and $\pi_i(T/Y, \eta)$ are vector sheaves for $i \geq 2$.

The idea behind the definition of "very presentable" is that we want to require the higher homotopy groups to be unipotent. Note that if we don't require π_1 to be affine, or π_i to be unipotent ($i \geq 2$), then the comparison between algebraic and analytic de Rham cohomology (announced in [Si]) is no longer true, even over the base $S = Spec(k)$ when all of the groups are representable. This is the reason for making the definition of "very presentable".

I make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1 *If G is an abelian affine presentable group sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ such that for any artinian $S' \to S$ the group scheme $G(S')$ over k is a direct sum of additive groups, then G is a vector sheaf.*

If we knew this conjecture, we could replace the condition of being a vector sheaf by the condition that the $G(S')$ are unipotent (hence additive) for $G = \pi_i$, $i \geq 2$; this would then be along the same lines as the affineness condition for π_1. As it is, we need to require the condition of π_i being vector schemes ($i \geq 2$) for many of the arguments concerning de Rham cohomology sketched in [Si] to work.

Remark: The categories of presentable and very presentable n-stacks are closed under weak equivalences and fiber products but not under cofiber products (push-outs); thus they are not closed model categories.

Remark: We have the same statement as Corollary 10.2 for very presentable stacks (if T is very presentable then $\tau_{\leq m}T$ is very presentable).

Other presentability conditions

Recall from [Si] that we used the notation $P6$ for affine presentable group sheaves and $P7$ for vector sheaves. An n-stack T on $\mathcal{X}$ is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-*presentable* (with $a_i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 3\frac{1}{2}, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$) if $\pi_0(T)$ is Pa_0 and if for any scheme Y and $t \in T(Y)$, $\pi_i(T, t)$ is Pa_i over Y. Here by convention $P0$ means no condition at all. Thus a presentable n-stack in our previous notation becomes a $(3\frac{1}{2}, 5, 5, \ldots)$-presentable n-stack in this notation. A very presentable n-stack is a $(3\frac{1}{2}, 6, 7, 7, \ldots)$-presentable n-stack. The old notions of presentability and very presentability as defined in [Si] are respectively $(3, 5, 5, \ldots)$-presentability and $(3, 6, 7, 7, \ldots)$ presentability. There may be some interest in considering, for example, the $(2, 2, 2, \ldots)$-presentable n-stacks, or the $(0, 0, 7, 7, 7, \ldots)$-presentable n-stacks.

Some other useful versions might be $(4, 5, 5, \ldots)$-presentable n-stacks, or $(4, 6, 7, 7, \ldots)$-presentable n-stacks for example. Here the condition $P4$ on π_0 would be with respect to $S = Spec(k)$. For example an algebraic stack with smooth morphisms from the morphism scheme to the object scheme (or even more strongly a Deligne-Mumford stack where these morphisms are etale) would be a $(4, 5)$-presentable stack. The converse is not true since in the condition of $(4, 5)$-presentability, the morphism sheaves are not necessarily representable. In fact we will never see the condition of representability of the morphism sheaves in our context, since this is unnatural from the point of view of higher-order stacks (and even in the context of algebraic stacks, one may wonder why the morphism object itself was never allowed to be an algebraic space?).

Remark: Again we have the statement of Corollary 10.2: if T is an $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable n-stack then $\tau_{\leq m}T$ is an $(a_0, \ldots, a_m)$-presentable m-stack.

Remark: A good convention for using all of these different notions would be to chose some variables A, B, etc. and set them to be specific $(a_0, a_1, \ldots)$ at the start of a discussion, then to use the notation "A-presentable" or "B-presentable" throughout the discussion.

A relative version of presentability

We can make a relative definition. In general, say that a morphism $T \to R$ of n-stacks is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-*presentable* if for any scheme $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ and any morphism $Y \to R$, the fiber $T \times_R Y$ is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable. In particular we obtain the notions of presentable and very presentable morphisms by taking $(3\frac{1}{2}, 5, 5, \ldots)$ and $(3\frac{1}{2}, 6, 7, 7, \ldots)$ respectively.

It is clear that if $T \to R$ is an $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable morphism and if $R' \to R$ is any morphism of n-stacks then the morphism $T' := T \times_R R' \to R'$ is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable.

Lemma 10.4 *Suppose that $a_0 \leq 5$. An n-stack T on $\mathcal{X}$ is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable if and only if the structural morphism $T \to *$ is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable.*

Proof: Since $*$ is itself a scheme of finite type (it is $Spec(k)$) the structural morphism being $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable implies that T is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable.

For the other implication, suppose T is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable, then for any scheme of finite type Y we have that $T \times Y = T \times_* Y$ is $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$-presentable (since a scheme Y is a_0-presentable for any $a_0 \leq 5$). □

Remark: If $\mathcal{G}$ is a sheaf of groups on $\mathcal{X}/S$ then $\mathcal{G}$ is a presentable group sheaf if and only if $K(\mathcal{G}, 1) \to S$ is a presentable morphism of 1-stacks. This is the correct point of view relating our terminologies "presentable group sheaf" and "presentable morphism" or "presentable n-stack", i.e. the answer to the terminological problem posed by the caution at the start of this section.

Theorem 10.5 *Suppose R is a presentable (resp. very presentable) n-stack. Then a morphism $T \to R$ is presentable (resp. very presentable) if and only if T itself is presentable (resp. very presentable).*

The proof of this theorem will be given in the next subsection below. We first state a few corollaries.

Corollary 10.6 *Suppose $T \to R$ and $S \to R$ are morphisms between presentable (resp. very presentable) n-stacks. Then the fiber product $T \times_R S$ is presentable (resp. very presentable).*

Proof: From the theorem, the morphism $T \to R$ is presentable, hence the morphism $T \times_R S$ is presentable and since S is presentable, again from the theorem we conclude that $T \times_R S$ is presentable. The same goes for very presentable. □

Lemma 10.7 *Suppose $R' \to R$ is a morphism inducing a surjection on π_0. Then a morphism $T \to R$ is presentable (resp. very presentable) if and only if the morphism $T' := T \times_R R' \to R'$ is presentable (resp. very presentable).*

Proof: One direction follows directly from the first remark after the definition above. For the other direction, suppose that $T' \to R'$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). Then for any scheme $Y \to R$ there is an etale covering $Y' \to Y$ and a lifting $Y' \to R'$, and we have

$$(T \times_R Y) \times_Y Y' = T \times_R Y' = T' \times_{R'} Y',$$

which is presentable (resp. very presentable) by hypothesis. The conditions on homotopy sheaves for being presentable (resp. very presentable) are etale-local, so $T \times_R Y$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). □

Corollary 10.8 *Suppose $R \to S$ and $S \to T$ are presentable (resp. very presentable) morphisms of n-stacks. Then the composition $R \to T$ is a presentable (resp. very presentable) morphism.*

Proof: Suppose X is a scheme of finite type with a morphism $X \to T$. Then

$$X \times_T R = (X \times_T S) \times_S R.$$

By hypothesis, $(X \times_T S)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable), and by the other hypothesis and the base change property given at the start of the subsection, the morphism $(X \times_T S) \times_S R \to (X \times_T S)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). Theorem 10.5 now implies that $X \times_T R$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). By definition then, the morphism $R \to T$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). □

Corollary 10.9 *Suppose $f : T \to R$ is a morphism such that R is presentable (resp. very presentable), and suppose $X \to R$ is a morphism from a scheme of finite type X which is surjective on π_0. Then T and the morphism f are presentable (resp. very presentable) if and only if $T \times_R X$ is presentable (resp. very presentable).*

Proof: By Lemma 10.7 the morphism f is presentable if and only if the morphism $p_2 : T \times_R X \to X$ is presentable. On the other hand, T is presentable if and only if f is presentable, from Theorem 10.5. Similarly $T \times_R X$ is presentable if and only if p_2 is presentable again by 10.5. This gives the desired statement (the same proof holds for very presentable). □

We now give some results that will be used in the proof of Theorem 10.5.

Lemma 10.10 *Suppose V is a vector sheaf and G is a presentable group sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$. If $f : V \to G$ is a morphism of group sheaves then the kernel of f is a vector sheaf.*

Proof: There is a natural isomorphism of vector sheaves $\varphi : V \cong Lie(V)$, such that φ reduces to the exponential on the values over artinian S'. To construct φ note that a section of V may be interpreted as a map $\mathcal{O} \to V$. We have a tautological section of $Lie(\mathcal{O})$ so for every section of V the image of this tautological section is a section of $Lie(V)$. This map is an isomorphism on values over artinian schemes, so it is an isomorphism.

Let $U \subset Lie(V)$ be the kernel of

$$Lie(f) : Lie(V) \to Lie(G).$$

Since $Lie(f)$ is a morphism of vector sheaves, its kernel U is a vector sheaf. We claim that $\varphi^{-1}(U)$ is the kernel of f. In order to prove this claim it suffices to prove it for the values over artinian S' (since both are presentable and contained in V, and using 1.4). Here it reduces to the following statement about Lie groups: the kernel of an algebraic morphism from a vector space to a Lie group is the exponential of the kernel of the corresponding morphism of Lie algebras. To prove this notice first that this exponential is a subvector subspace; we can take the quotient and then we are reduced to the case where the map is injective on Lie algebras. The kernel is thus a finite subgroup, but a vector space contains no finite subgroups so we are done. □

Proposition 10.11 *Suppose R, S and T are n-stacks over $\mathcal{X}$, with morphisms $R \to T$ and $S \to T$. Suppose $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $(r, s) \in R \times_T S(Z)$. Let $t \in T(Z)$ be the common image of r and s. Then we have the following long exact sequence of homotopy group sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/Z$:*

$$\ldots \to \pi_i(R \times_T S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, (r, s)) \to \pi_i(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r) \times \pi_i(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}) \to$$

$$\pi_i(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, t) \to \pi_{i-1}(R \times_T S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, (r, s)) \to \ldots,$$

terminating with the sequence

$$\pi_2(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r) \times \pi_2(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s) \to \pi_2(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, t) \to \pi_1(R \times_T S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, (r, s)) \to$$

$$\pi_1(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r) \times \pi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s) \stackrel{\to}{\to} \pi_1(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, t)$$

(the last part meaning that the image is equal to the equalizer of the two arrows). Furthermore, we have a similar sequence for the path spaces. Suppose (r_1, s_1) *and* (r_2, s_2) *are two points, with images* t_1 *and* t_2*. We have the exact sequence*

$$\pi_2(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r_1) \times \pi_2(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s_1) \to \pi_2(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, t_1) \stackrel{acts\ on}{\to} \varpi_1(R \times_T S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, (r_1, s_1), (r_2, s_2))$$

$$with\ quotient\ the\ equalizer\ of \varpi_1(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r_1, r_2) \times \varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s_1, s_2) \stackrel{\to}{\to} \varpi_1(T|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, t_1, t_2).$$

Proof: We show that we have similar exact sequences at the homotopy presheaf level; then the sequences for the homotopy sheaves follow by sheafification. To define the exact sequences at the presheaf level, we can work object by object, so it suffices to give functorial exact sequences for fibrations of topological spaces $R \to T$ and $S \to T$ with basepoints (r, s) mapping to t. The morphisms are defined as follows. The morphism from $\pi_i(R \times_T S, (r, s))$ to $\pi_i(R, r) \times \pi_i(S, s) = \pi_i(R \times S, (r, s))$ comes from the inclusion $R \times_T S \to R \times S$. The morphism from the product to $\pi_i(T, t)$ is the difference of the two projection maps. The morphism from $\pi_i(T, t)$ to $\pi_{i-1}(R \times_T S, (r, s))$ is obtained as a composition

$$\pi_i(T, t) \stackrel{\delta}{\to} \pi_{i-1}(R_t, r) \stackrel{(1,0_s)}{\to} \pi_{i-1}(R_t \times S_t, (r, s)) \stackrel{i}{\to} \pi_{i-1}(R \times_T S, (r, s))$$

where δ is the connecting homomorphism for the fibration $R \to T$, 0_s is the constant class at the basepoint s, and i is the inclusion of the fiber $i : R_t \times S_t \to R \times_T S$. If we took $(1, 1)$ instead of $(1, 0_s)$ we would get the connecting morphism for the fibration $R \times_T S \to T$, which goes to zero in the homotopy of the total space $R \times_T S$. Thus, our map is the same as the map which would be obtained by putting in $-(0_r, 1)$ instead. From the equality of these two maps, one obtains that the composition of this map with the difference of projections, is equal to zero. That the other compositions are zero is easy to see. Exactness follows by making a diagram with this sequence on one horizontal row, with the sequence

$$\pi_i(R_t \times S_t, (r, s)) = \pi_i(R_t, r) \times \pi_i(S_t, s) \to 0 \to \ldots$$

on the row above, and the sequence

$$\pi_i(T, t) \to \pi_i(T, t) \times \pi_i(T, t) \to \pi_i(T, t) \stackrel{0}{\to} \pi_{i-1}(T, t)$$

on the row below. The vertical rows then have the exact fibration sequences going downwards. One obtains the exactness of the sequence of homotopy groups in question (this works at the end by using the extension of the homotopy sequence for a fibration, to the action of π_1 of the base on π_0 of the fiber, with the π_1 of the total space being the stabilizer of the component of π_0 of the fiber containing the basepoint.

Finally, we treat the case of the path spaces. What is written on the left means, more precisely, that the cokernel of the first map acts freely on the middle sheaf, with quotient equal to the equalizer. The action in question is by the map to $\pi_1(R \times_T S, (r_1, s_1))$ which itself acts on the path space. Now if $\varpi_1(R \times_T S, (r_1, s_1), (r_2, s_2))$ is empty then the equalizer in question is also empty (any element of the equalizer can be realized as a pair of paths mapping to exactly the same path in T, giving a path in the fiber product). Note that we count an action on the empty set as free. So we may assume that $\varpi_1(R \times_T S, (r_1, s_1), (r_2, s_2))$ is nonempty, and choose an element. This choice gives compatible choices in all the other path spaces, so composing with the inverse of this path we reduce to the exact sequence for fundamental groups. □

Remark: We can extend this sequence to a statement involving π_0, specially in the case of a fibration sequence. This will be done as we need it below.

Lemma 10.12 *Suppose S is a base scheme and suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ whose restriction down to $\mathcal{X}$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is a $P4$ sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/S$ with morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F}$, and finally suppose that $\eta : S \to \mathcal{F}$ is a section. Then the inverse image $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$ of the section η is a $P4$ sheaf.*

Proof: Let $X \to \mathcal{G}$ and $W \to X \times_{\mathcal{G}} X$ be the S-vertical surjections for $\mathcal{G}$. Fix a surjection $Z \to \mathcal{F}$ and a surjection $W \to Z \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z$ which is vertical with respect to the first projection to Z. Fix a lifting η' of the section to Z (note that we are allowed to etale-localize on the base S). Let $U := S \times_Z W$ where the morphism in the fiber product is the first projection from W to Z (note that U is a scheme of finite type over S). The surjective morphism

$$U \to S \times_Z (Z \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z) = S \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z$$

is S-vertical since the morphism $W \to Z \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z$ was Z-vertical. We can choose a lifting $X \to Z$ of the morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{F}$. Then

$$S \times_{\mathcal{F}} X = (S \times_{\mathcal{F}} Z) \times_Z X$$

so there is an S-vertical morphism

$$U \times_Z X \to S \times_{\mathcal{F}} X.$$

On the other hand the S-vertical morphism $X \to \mathcal{G}$ gives an S-vertical morphism

$$S \times_{\mathcal{F}} X \to S \times_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}.$$

Note that $Y := U \times_Z X$ is a scheme of finite type with a surjective vertical morphism to $\mathcal{H}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is $P4$ there exists a scheme of finite type V and an S-vertical morphism

$$V \to Y \times_{\mathcal{G}} Y = Y \times_{\mathcal{H}} Y.$$

This gives the condition $P4$ for $\mathcal{H}$. □

The following lemma is a consequence of Corollary 10.6, but we need it in the proof of Theorem 10.5.

Lemma 10.13 *If R and S are presentable (resp. very presentable) n-stacks over $\mathcal{X}$ and X a scheme of finite type, with morphisms $R \to S$ and $X \to S$, then the homotopy fiber product $X \times_S R$ is presentable (resp. very presentable).*

Proof: Suppose $f : Y \to X \times_S R$ is a morphism. Let $r : Y \to R$ and $s : Y \to S$ be the composed morphisms. Then (since X is zero-truncated) for $i \geq 1$ we have

$$\pi_i(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, f) = \pi_i(Y \times_S R/Y, r).$$

The latter fits into a homotopy exact sequence, which we can therefore write

$$\ldots \pi_{i+1}(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, s) \to \pi_i(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, f) \to \pi_i(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, r) \to \ldots.$$

In the presentable case we obtain immediately from Theorem 1.13 that $\pi_i(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, f)$ is a presentable group sheaf over Y. In the very presentable case, for $i \geq 3$ we obtain immediately (from Corollary 4.10 and Theorem 4.11) that $\pi_i(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, f)$ is a vector sheaf. For $i = 2$ we obtain the same conclusion but must also use Lemma 10.10. For $i = 1$ we obtain that $\pi_1(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, f)$ is $P5$. In fact it is an extension of the kernel of a morphism of $P6$ group sheaves, by a vector sheaf. Therefore it

is also affine (since kernels and extensions by vector sheaves at least, preserve the affineness property). Thus it is $P6$.

We just have to prove (in both the presentable and very presentable case) that $\pi_0(X \times_S R)$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. Let $a : X \to S$ denote the given morphism. Recall that $\pi_0(X \times_S R)/X$ denotes this sheaf considered as a sheaf on $\mathcal{X}/X$. We have an action of $\pi_0(S|_{\mathcal{X}/X}, a)$ (which is a $P5$ group sheaf over X) on $\pi_0(X \times_S R)/X$, and the quotient is the fiber product $X \times_{\pi_0(S)} \pi_0(R)/X$ (i.e. again considered as a sheaf over $\mathcal{X}/X$). This is the same thing as the inverse image of the given section a via the map $\pi_0(R|_{\mathcal{X}/X}) \to \pi_0(S|_{\mathcal{X}/X})$. By Corollary 2.11 or 2.12 the quotient by the action is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. Finally by Proposition 2.13, the sheaf $\pi_0(X \times_S R)$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$. □

Remark: A similar technique allows one to directly prove Corollary 10.6, that if R, S and T are presentable (resp. very presentable) n-stacks with morphisms $R \to S$ and $T \to S$ then the fiber product $R \times_S T$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). This is left to the reader. Our technique is to use only the above special case to get Theorem 10.5, and then to deduce Corollary 10.6 as a consequence.

The proof of Theorem 10.5

Lemma 10.13 immediately implies one direction in Theorem 10.5, namely that if R and S are presentable then the morphism f is presentable.

We have to show the other direction: suppose S is a presentable n-stack, R is an n-stack, and $f : R \to S$ is a presentable morphism. Choose a scheme of finite type X with a morphism $X \to S$ inducing a surjection on π_0. We will show that if $X \times_S R$ is presentable then R is presentable.

First of all the morphism $\pi_0(X \times_S R) \to \pi_0(R)$ is surjective so if $\pi_0(X \times_S R)$ is $P1$ then so is $\pi_0(R)$. For the higher homotopy groups, suppose that $s : Z \to R$ is a morphism. Lift the projection into S (denoted by s) to a morphism $Z \to X$. This gives a point $f : Z \to X \times_S R$ and by composition $f_Z : Z \to Z \times_S R = Z \times_X (X \times_S R)$. Then we have the exact sequence

$$\ldots \to \pi_i(Z \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f_Z) \to \pi_i(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r) \to \pi_i(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s) \to \ldots.$$

But since Z and $X|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}$ are zero-truncated, and we have that $Z \times_S R = Z \times_X (X \times_S R)$, the higher homotopy groups $\pi_i(Z \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f_Z)$ are the same as the $\pi_i(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f)$. Thus we can write the exact sequence as

$$\ldots \to \pi_i(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f) \to \pi_i(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r) \to \pi_i(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s) \to \ldots.$$

Note that (in the very presentable case) the kernel of the morphism

$$\pi_2(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s) \to \pi_1(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f)$$

is a vector sheaf by Lemma 10.10. In the other cases the kernel (and the cokernel on the other end) are automatically vector sheaves by Corollary 4.10. Since the property of being a vector sheaf is preserved under extension we get the condition that the $\pi_i(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r)$ are vector sheaves ($i \geq 2$). In the presentable case the exact sequence immediately gives the property $P5$ for the $\pi_i(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r)$ for ($i \geq 2$).

We have to treat the case of ϖ_1. Suppose $Z \to Y$ is a morphism of finite type and suppose $r, r' : Z \to R$ are points such that r factors through Y. Let s, s' denote the images in S and assume that they lift to points f, f' and f_Z, f'_Z as above (with f or f_Z factoring through Y).

We first study everything on the level of sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/Z$. Note first that

$$Z \times_{S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} (R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}) \to R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z} \to S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}$$

is a fibration sequence (this should actually have been pointed out above in the treatment of the π_i, $i \geq 2$), over the basepoint $s \in S(Z)$. On the other hand note that $r' : Z \to R$ is a point lying over s'. Consider the map

$$\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s') \to \pi_0(Z \times_{S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} (R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}))$$

which sends a path to the point obtained by transporting f'_Z along the path from s' back to s. The fibration sequence gives the following statement:

The group $\pi_1(Z \times_{S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} (R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f_Z)$ acts on $\varpi_1(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r, r')$ with quotient the inverse image in $\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s')$ of the section $f_Z : Z \to \pi_0(Z \times_{S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} (R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z})$.

Now we note that

$$\pi_1(Z \times_{S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} (R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f_Z) = \pi_1(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f),$$

and

$$\pi_0(Z \times_{S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} (R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}) \subset \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}).$$

The transport of f' along the path from s' to s again gives a map

$$\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s') \to \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z})$$

and we obtain the following statement.

The group $\pi_1(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, f)$ acts on $\varpi_1(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r, r')$ with quotient the inverse image in $\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s')$ of the section $f : Z \to \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z})$.

Now we look at everything in terms of sheaves on $\mathcal{X}/Y$. Let $Res_{Z/Y}$ denote the restriction from Z down to Y, and let $\tilde{f}$ denote the Y-valued point corresponding to f. Note that

$$Res_{Z/Y}\pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}) = \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}) \times_Y Z.$$

In general if $\mathcal{A}$ is a sheaf over Z and $\mathcal{B}$ a sheaf over Y with a section $Y \to \mathcal{B}$ then

$$Res_{Z/Y}(\mathcal{A} \times_{\mathcal{B}|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}} Z) = (Res_{Z/Y}\mathcal{A}) \times_{\mathcal{B}} Y.$$

In particular the inverse image in $\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s')$ of the section $f : Z \to \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z})$ restricts down to Y to the inverse image in $Res_{Z/Y}\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s')$ of the section $\tilde{f} : Y \to \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y})$.

Another general principal is that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a group sheaf on Y such that $\mathcal{G}|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}$ acts on a sheaf $\mathcal{H}$ then $\mathcal{G}$ acts on $Res_{Z/Y}\mathcal{H}$ with quotient equal to $Res_{Z/Y}(\mathcal{H}/(\mathcal{G}|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}))$.

With these things in mind, our above statement becomes:

The group $\pi_1((X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, \tilde{f})$ acts on $Res_{Z/Y}\varpi_1(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r, r')$ with quotient the inverse image in $Res_{Z/Y}\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s')$ of the section $\tilde{f} : Y \to \pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y})$.

Now the facts that $\pi_0(X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y})$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$ and that $Res_{Z/Y}\varpi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, s, s')$ is $P4$ (which comes by hypothesis) imply that the inverse image in question is $P4$ (Lemma 10.12); then the theorem on quotients (Theorem 1.10) and the fact that the group $\pi_1((X \times_S R|_{\mathcal{X}/Y}, \tilde{f})$ is $P5$ over Y gives the condition that $Res_{Z/Y}\varpi_1(R|_{\mathcal{X}/Z}, r, r')$ is $P4$ over Y.

This is the condition on ϖ_1 needed to insure that R is presentable. This completes the proof of Theorem 10.5. □

We have the following characterization of presentable morphisms via the relative homotopy group sheaves.

Proposition 10.14 *Suppose $f : R \to S$ is a morphism of n-stacks. Then f is presentable (resp. very presentable) if and only if the following conditions are satisfied for any scheme X of finite type:*
—for any morphism $X \to S$, the sheaf $\pi_0(X \times_S R)$ is $P3\frac{1}{2}$; and
—for any morphism $r : X \to R$ the sheaves $\pi_i(X \times_S R/X, r)$ on $\mathcal{X}/X$ are presentable group sheaves over X (resp. π_1 is affine presentable and π_i are vector sheaves for $i \geq 2$).

Proof: This falls out of the proof of 10.5. □

Exercise: For which values of $(a_0, a_1, \ldots)$ does Theorem 10.13 hold for $(a_0, a_1, \ldots)$-presentable spaces? Place these conditions in Corollary 10.15 below.

Going to the base of a fibration

It is an interesting question to ask, if $R \to S$ is a morphism of n-stacks such that R is presentable and such that for every scheme-valued point $X \to S$ the fiber product $X \times_S R$ is presentable, then is S presentable? The answer is surely no in this generality. We need to make additional hypotheses. Directly from the fibration exact sequences, one can see that if $\pi_0(S)$ is assumed to be $P3\frac{1}{2}$ (a hypothesis which seems unavoidable) and if we suppose that for any point $a : X \to S$, the action of $\pi_1(S|_{\mathcal{X}/X}, a)$ on $\pi_0(X \times_S R)$ factors through a presentable group sheaf over X, then S will be presentable.

As a particular case, if the morphism $R \to S$ is relatively 0-connected (i.e. the fibers are connected) and surjective on π_0, then presentability of R implies presentability of S.

One might look for other weaker conditions, for example that the fibers satisfy some sort of artinian condition (e.g. there is a surjection from a scheme finite over X, to $\pi_0(X \times_S R)$). I don't know if this can be made to work.

Presentable shapes

We have a notion of internal Hom for n-stacks. In the topological presheaf interpretation ([Si] §2), recall that $\underline{Hom}(R, T)$ is defined to be the presheaf $X \mapsto Hom(R'_X, T|_{\mathcal{X}/X})$ where R'_X is a functorial replacement of $R|_{\mathcal{X}/X}$ by a cofibrant presheaf.

Corollary 10.15 *Suppose W is a finite CW complex, and let $W_{\mathcal{X}}$ denote the constant n-stack with values $\Pi_n(W)$ (or in terms of presheaves of spaces, it is the fibrant presheaf associated to the constant presheaf with values $\tau_{\leq n}W$). If T is a presentable (resp. very presentable) n-stack over X then the n-stack $\underline{Hom}(W_{\mathcal{X}}, T)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable).*

Proof: We first show this for $W = S^m$, the m-sphere. Do this by induction on m. It is clear for $m = 0$ because then W consists of two points and $\underline{Hom}(W_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = T \times T$. For any m, write S^m as the union of two copies of B^m joined along S^{m-1}. We get

$$\underline{Hom}(S^m_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = T \times_{\underline{Hom}(S^{m-1}_{\mathcal{X}}, T)} T,$$

since $\underline{Hom}(B^m_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = T$. By Theorem 10.13, $\underline{Hom}(S^m_{\mathcal{X}}, T)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). This shows the corollary for the spheres.

We now treat the case of general W, by induction on the number of cells. We may thus write $W = W' \cup B^m$ with the cell B^m attached over an attaching map $S^{m-1} \to W'$, and where we know the result for W'. Then

$$\underline{Hom}(W_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = \underline{Hom}(W'_{\mathcal{X}}, T) \times_{\underline{Hom}(S^{m-1}_{\mathcal{X}}, T)} T.$$

Again by Theorem 10.13, we obtain the result for W. □

Let $Pres^n/\mathcal{X}$ denote the $n+1$-category of presentable n-stacks. We define the *presentable shape* of W to be the $n+1$-functor

$$Shape(W) : T \mapsto \underline{Hom}(\underline{W}, T)$$

from $Pres^n/\mathcal{X}$ to $Pres^n/\mathcal{X}$.

One can show (using the calculations of [Si] Corollary 3.9 over $S = Spec(k)$) that if W is connected and simply connected then this functor is homotopy-representable by an object $Hull(W) \in Pres/\mathcal{X}$. On the other hand, in most cases where W is not simply connected, the presentable shape is not representable. We could try to interpret the hull of W as the inverse limit of $Shape(W)$, but this is not a standard kind of inverse limit. It is a question for further study, just what information is contained in $Shape(W)$.

Example: Take $G = GL(n)$ and $T = K(G,1)$. Fix a finite CW complex U. Then $M := \underline{Hom}(U,T)$ is the moduli stack for flat principal G-bundles (i.e. flat vector bundles of rank n) on U.

More generally it should be interesting to look at presentable or very presentable *connected* T, these are objects whose homotopy group sheaves are algebraic Lie groups over $Spec(k)$. Note that if k is algebraically closed then there is an essentially unique choice of basepoint $t \in T(Spec(k))$. If $G = \pi_1(T,t)$ then we have a fibration $T \to K(G,1)$ and we get a morphism

$$\underline{Hom}(U,T) \to \underline{Hom}(U, K(G,1)).$$

This expresses $\underline{Hom}(U,T)$ as a presentable n-stack over the moduli stack M of flat principal G-bundles over U.

One can see from this example that we should consider the notion of vector sheaf as a candidate for the higher homotopy group sheaves.

Leray theory

We develop here a nonabelian Leray theory and Künneth formula. This is in some sense one of the principal reasons for going to nonconnected n-stacks, as they can intervene as intermediate steps even when the original coefficient stacks were connected.

We give some notation for the stack of sections. If $T \to S$ is a morphism of n-stacks on $\mathcal{X}$ (or on any site) then we denote by $\underline{\Gamma}(S,T)$ the n-stack of sections, i.e. of diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \to & T \\ & =\searrow & \downarrow \\ & & S \end{array}$$

(with homotopy making the diagram commutative).

We also have a notion of relative morphism stack. Suppose that $T \to S$ and $T' \to S$ are two morphisms of n-stacks. Then we obtain an n-stack together with morphism to S

$$\underline{Hom}(T/S, T'/S) \to S.$$

In topological language this corresponds to the space whose fiber over s is the space of morphisms from T_s to T'_s. This should not be confused with another useful construction in the same situation, the space

$$\underline{Hom}_S(T,T')$$

which is the n-stack of diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \to & T' \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & S \end{array}$$

(again with homotopy making the diagram commutative).

These things can be constructed using the point of view of simplicial presheaves or presheaves of spaces—cf for example [Si2]. It remains to be seen how to give constructions of these things purely within the realm of stacks (and consequently to extend the same constructions to stacks of n-categories which are not necessarily n-groupoids).

We have the following relationships among the above constructions. First of all, $\underline{\Gamma}(S,T) = \underline{Hom}_S(S,T)$. Then,

Lemma 10.16 *Suppose $T \to S$ and $T' \to S$ are morphisms of n-stacks. There is a natural equivalence*

$$\underline{\Gamma}(S, \underline{Hom}(T/S, T'/S)) \cong \underline{Hom}_S(T, T').$$

Proof: From the point of view of presheaves of spaces, see [Si2]. □

Finally note that if T is an n-stack and $R \to S$ is a morphism of n-stacks then

$$\underline{Hom}_S(R/S, T \times S/S) \cong \underline{Hom}(R,T).$$

From the above lemma we obtain a method of "devissage":

Corollary 10.17 *Suppose T is an n-stack and $R \to S$ is a morphism of n-stacks, then*

$$\underline{Hom}(R,T) \cong \underline{\Gamma}(S, \underline{Hom}(R/S, T \times S/S)).$$

□

In words this says that to calculate the stack of morphisms from R to T we first look at the fiberwise morphisms from R/S to T, and then we take the sections over S. Rather than taking the internal morphism and section spaces we can take the external ones, removing the underline in the notation which means taking the sections over $*$ (which is $Spec(k)$ in our case). We get the statement

$$Hom(R,T) \cong \Gamma(S, \underline{Hom}(R/S, T \times S/S)).$$

Note that it is still essential to look at the internal $\underline{Hom}$ inside the space of sections.

It might be worthwhile looking at how this works in the case of usual cohomology. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is a sheaf of abelian groups on $\mathcal{X}$. Let $T = K(\mathcal{A}, n)$, so that $Hom(R,T)$ is an n-groupoid with homotopy groups

$$\pi_i = H^{n-i}(R, \mathcal{A}).$$

Similarly $\underline{Hom}(R/S,T)$ is an n-stack over S whose relative homotopy group sheaves over S are the higher direct images

$$\pi_i = R^{n-i} f_*(\mathcal{A}|_R).$$

There is a spectral sequence for the n-stack of sections going from the cohomology of S with coefficients in the relative homotopy sheaves to the homotopy groups of the space of sections, which turns out to be the Leray spectral sequence in this case.

This version of Leray theory is due to Thomason [Th], who developed it mostly in the context of presheaves of spectra.

We finally introduce one more bit of notation combining the previous notations, that is the *relative section stack*. Suppose $R \to S \to T$ are morphisms of n-stacks. Then we obtain the n-stack

$$\underline{\Gamma}(S/T, R/T) \to T$$

which is geometrically the "fiberwise space of sections of the morphism $R \to S$ along the fibers of $S \to T$". The above Leray theory can itself be presented in a relative context:

Lemma 10.18 *Suppose $R \to S \to T \to U$ are morphisms of n-stacks. Then*

$$\underline{\Gamma}(T/U, \underline{\Gamma}(S/T, R/T)/U) \cong \underline{\Gamma}(T/U, R/U).$$

□

Of course, given four morphisms there should be a diagram expressing compatibility of these Leray equivalences (and further diagrams of homotopy between the homotopies).

Leray theory for presentable and very presentable n-stacks

Now we get back to presentable and very presentable n-stacks. Our goal is to show that in certain cases the Leray theory stays within the world of presentable n-stacks.

The first task is to generalize Corollary 10.15 to the case of a local coefficient system, i.e. a presentable morphism of n-stacks to our given finite CW complex.

Lemma 10.19 *Suppose U is a constant n-stack associated to the n-groupoids associated to a finite CW complex. Suppose $T \to U$ is a presentable (resp. very presentable) morphism of n-stacks. Then the n-groupoid of sections $\underline{\Gamma}(U, T)$ is a presentable (resp. very presentable) n-stack.*

Proof: The proof is identical to that of Corollary 10.15 but we repeat it here for the reader's convenience. As before, we first treat the case $U = S^m$ by induction on m. It is clear for $m = 0$ because then W consists of two points a, b and $\underline{\Gamma}(W_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = T_a \times T_b$, with the fibers T_a and T_b being presentable (resp. very presentable). Now for any m, write S^m as the union of two copies of B^m joined along S^{m-1} and let T_a be the fiber of T over a basepoint. This fiber is presentable (resp. very presentable). We get

$$\underline{\Gamma}(S^m_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = T_a \times_{\underline{\Gamma}(S^{m-1}_{\mathcal{X}}, T)} T_a,$$

since $\underline{\Gamma}(B^m_{\mathcal{X}}, T) \cong T_a$. By the induction hypothesis and Theorem 10.13, $\underline{\Gamma}(S^m_{\mathcal{X}}, T)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). This shows the lemma for the spheres.

We now treat the case of general U, by induction on the number of cells. We may thus write $U = U' \cup B^m$ with the cell B^m attached over an attaching map $S^{m-1} \to U'$, and where we know the result for U'. Again let T_a be the fiber over a basepoint in the attached cell. Then

$$\underline{\Gamma}(U_{\mathcal{X}}, T) = \underline{\Gamma}(U'_{\mathcal{X}}, T) \times_{\underline{\Gamma}(S^{m-1}_{\mathcal{X}}, T)} T_a.$$

By Theorem 10.13 and the above result for spheres, we obtain the result for U. □

Say that a morphism $U \to V$ of n-stacks is *of finite CW type* if for any scheme of finite type X with morphism $X \to V$ there is a covering family $\{Y_\alpha \to X\}$ and finite CW complexes W^α such that $Y_\alpha \times_V U \cong Y_\alpha \times W^\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}$ (with $W^\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}$ being the constant n-stack associated to $\Pi_n(W^\alpha)$ as defined previously).

Theorem 10.20 *Suppose $U \to V$ is a morphism of n-stacks of finite CW type, and suppose $T \to U$ is a presentable (resp. very presentable) morphism of n-stacks. Then $\underline{\Gamma}(U/V, T/V) \to V$ is a presentable (resp. very presentable) morphism.*

Proof: Suppose X is a scheme of finite type with a morphism $X \to V$. Let $\{Y^\alpha \to X\}$ be the covering family and $\{W^\alpha\}$ the collection of finite CW complexes with isomorphisms $U \times_V Y^\alpha \cong W^\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}$ given by the fact that $U \to V$ is a morphism of finite CW type. It suffices to prove that

$$\underline{\Gamma}(U/V, T/V) \times_V Y^\alpha = \underline{\Gamma}(U \times_V Y^\alpha/Y^\alpha, T \times_V Y^\alpha/Y^\alpha)$$

is presentable (resp. very presentable). Thus it suffices to prove the theorem in the case where V is a scheme of finite type and $U = V \times W_{\mathcal{X}}$ for a finite CW complex W. With these hypotheses we return to the notations of the theorem. If W is a finite union of components then the section space in question will be the product of the section spaces of each of the components. Thus we may assume that W is connected. The n-stack of sections from $W_{\mathcal{X}}$ to $V \times W_{\mathcal{X}}$ is isomorphic to V. Thus the n-stack of sections of the morphism $T \to W_{\mathcal{X}}$ maps to V, and this n-stack of sections is the same as the relative section stack $\underline{\Gamma}(U/V, T/V)$. It suffices to prove that $\underline{\Gamma}(W_{\mathcal{X}}, T)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable). But the morphism $V \times W_{\mathcal{X}} \to W_{\mathcal{X}}$ is very presentable, so by Corollary 10.8 the morphism $T \to W_{\mathcal{X}}$ is presentable (resp. very presentable), and Lemma 10.19 applies to give that $\underline{\Gamma}(W_{\mathcal{X}}, T)$ is presentable (resp. very presentable) as needed. □

Corollary 10.21 *Suppose $U \to V$ is a morphism of n-stacks of finite CW type and Suppose $T \to V$ is a presentable morphism of n-stacks. Then the morphism*

$$\underline{Hom}(U/V, T/V) \to V$$

is a presentable morphism.

Proof: We have

$$\underline{Hom}(U/V, T/V) = \underline{\Gamma}(U/V, T \times_V U/V)$$

and $T \times_V U \to U$ is presentable by 10.6, so Theorem 10.20 applies. □

Corollary 10.22 *Suppose T is a presentable n-stack, and suppose $V \to U$ is a morphism whose fibers are finite CW complexes in the sense of the above theorem. Then*

$$\underline{Hom}(V/U, T \times U/U) \to U$$

is a presentable morphism.

Proof: Indeed, the morphism $T \times U \to U$ is presentable. □

We look at the case of a morphism of n-groupoids $f : U \to V$ such that U and V are the n-groupoids associated to finite CW complexes. Suppose that the fibers of f are the n-groupoids associated to finite CW complexes. This is the case for example if f comes from a smooth morphism of manifolds. For a presentable n-stack T we can calculate

$$\underline{Hom}(V, T) = \underline{\Gamma}(U, \underline{Hom}(V/U, T \times U/U)).$$

Corollary 10.22 states that $\underline{Hom}(V/U, T \times U/U) \to U$ is a presentable morphism, and Lemma 10.19 (which is also a corollary of Theorem 10.20) states that for any presentable morphism $R \to U$ the space of sections is presentable. We obtain in particular the presentability of $\underline{Hom}(V, T)$ (which we already knew beforehand). The Leray devissage process thus stays within the realm of presentable n-stacks.

The Künneth formula: We can apply the above discussion to the particular case where $V = U \times U'$ is a product. In this case the formula is simplified:

$$\underline{Hom}(U \times U', T) = \underline{Hom}(U, \underline{Hom}(U', T))$$

and again (this time using only Corollary 10.15) this process of first taking $\underline{Hom}(U', T)$ and then $\underline{Hom}(U, -)$ stays within the realm of presentable n-stacks.

Of course the entire discussion above works equally well if we replace "presentable" by "very presentable".

Example: Take $G = GL(n)$ and $T = K(G, 1)$. Then $M' := \underline{Hom}(U', T)$ is the moduli stack for flat principal G-bundles (i.e. flat vector bundles of rank n) on U'. After that, assuming that U is connected, $\underline{Hom}(U, M')$ is the moduli stack of flat G-bundles on $U \times U'$.

More generally it should be interesting to look at presentable or very presentable *connected* T, these are objects whose homotopy group sheaves are algebraic Lie groups over $Spec(k)$. Note that if k is algebraically closed then there is an essentially unique choice of basepoint $t \in T(Spec(k))$. If $G = \pi_1(T, t)$ then we have a fibration $T \to K(G, 1)$ and we get a morphism

$$\underline{Hom}(U, T) \to \underline{Hom}(U, K(G, 1)).$$

This expresses $\underline{Hom}(U, T)$ as a presentable n-stack over the moduli stack M of flat principal G-bundles over U.

References

[Ar] M. Artin. Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **36**, (1969), 23-58.

[A-M] R. Axelsson and J. Magunússon. A closure operation on complex analytic cones and torsion. Submitted to *Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse* (??? a paraitre ???).

[Br] L. Breen. Extensions du groupe additif, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **48**, (1978), 39-126.

[Br2] L. Breen. *On the classification of* 2*-gerbes and* 2*-stacks. Astérisque* **255**, S.M.F. (1994).

[D-M] P. Deligne, D. Mumford. The irreducibility of the space of curves of a given genus, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **36**, (1969), 75-110.

[Fis] G. Fischer. Lineare Faserräume und kohärente Modulgarben über komplexen Räumen. *Arch. Math.* **18** (1967), 609-617.

[Gra] H. Grauert. Uber Modifkationen und exzeptionelle analytische Mengen. *Math. Ann.* **146** (1962), 331-368.

[Gr1] A. Grothendieck. On the de Rham cohomology of algebraic varieties. *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **29**, (1966), 95-103.

[Gr2] A. Grothendieck. *Pursuing Stacks*, manuscript available from Université de Montpellier or the University of Bangor.

[Ha] R. Hartshorne. On the de Rham cohomology of algebraic varieties. *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **45**, (1975), 5-99.

[Hi] A. Hirschowitz. Cohérence et dualité sur le gros site de Zariski, *Algebraic curves and projective geometry* (Ballico, Ciliberto eds.), *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1389**, (1989), 91-102.

[Il] L. Illusie. *Le complexe cotangent I et II*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **239, 283**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1971,1972).

[Ja] J.F. Jardine. Simplicial presheaves, *J. Pure and Appl. Algebra bf 47* (1987), 35-87.

[Si] C. Simpson. Homotopy over the complex numbers and generalized de Rham cohomology. *Moduli of Vector Bundles*, M. Maruyama (Ed.), *Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics* **179**, Marcel Dekker (1996), 229-263.

[Si2] C. Simpson. Flexible sheaves and homotopy over $Spec(\mathbf{C})$. Preprint available at http://130.120.82.74

[Ta] Z. Tamsamani. On non-strict notions of n-category and n-groupoid via multisimplicial sets. Chapters 1-2 of thesis, Université Paul Sabatier, June 1996; alg-geom preprint 95-12-006.

[Ta2] Z. Tamsamani. Equivalence de la théorie homotopique des n-groupoides et celle des espaces topologiques n-tronqués. Chapter 3 of thesis, Université Paul Sabatier, June 1996 (soon to appear on alg-geom).

[Th] Thomason. Algebraic K-theory and etale cohomology, *Ann. Sci. E.N.S.* **18** (1985), 437-552.

[Wh] H. Whitney. Local properties of analytic varieties. *Differential and Combinatorial Topology (A symposium in honor of Marston Morse)*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton (1965), 205-244.